

# The Solicitors Journal.

LONDON, APRIL 3, 1886.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

ALL THE JUDGES were summoned to meet the Lord Chancellor on Wednesday afternoon last, and the courts rose at three o'clock to enable the members of the bench to attend the meeting.

LORD JUSTICE FRY was absent from court on account of illness on Tuesday last, but returned, apparently quite recovered, on the following day. Mr. Justice KAY was also obliged, on Wednesday, to be absent from illness, and it is understood that he will not return before Monday next. During his absence, Mr. Justice NORTH has undertaken some of his chamber work.

WE PRINT elsewhere Mr. O'HEA's "Bill to repeal the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty," which was only issued on Thursday last, though ordered by the House of Commons to be printed on the 8th ult. It will be seen that the Bill provides for the abolition of the duty "from and after the passing of this Act"; for the taking out of a certificate by every solicitor, for which a sum of ten shillings is to be charged, and for such certificate being equivalent to a stamped certificate. The Bill appears to be rather roughly drafted, and does not make it clear whether the certificate is to be taken out once for all, or whether, on a change of residence by a solicitor, he will have to take out a new certificate.

THE DELAYS which have so frequently been complained of as occurring in the offices of the Chancery Taxing Masters have, at length, engaged the attention of the authorities, and it is understood that the Lord Chancellor is considering whether he shall appoint a ninth taxing master, so as to expedite business. During the period when there were only seven of these officials, it was a common complaint that, unless a bill were carried in before the end of April, the chance of getting it taxed before the Long Vacation was somewhat remote. In 1879, when an eighth master was appointed, complaints of a like nature were also heard. These delays were, and are due to the pressure of business, and not to any fault of the masters. As regards the fees taken by the taxing masters, they increased during the fifteen years before an eighth taxing master was appointed from £21,573 to £35,093, so that an increase of upwards of one-fifth in the work was ample warrant for adding one-seventh to the strength of the workers. During the five years which succeeded 1879 the annual average amount of fees taken in the Chancery Taxing Office has been £35,169, whereas, in the fifteen years previous, the average was only £28,977. The year 1880 was that in which most fees were taken and the largest amount of costs taxed during the twenty years up to 1884, but since 1880 both the fees and the amount of the bills taxed have rather decreased, though the average has been high. The salaries of the whole staff do not, we believe, exceed £22,000. The margin of fees thus shewn is far more than sufficient to pay the salary of another taxing master and of his staff, and this, coupled with the delays complained of, certainly give sufficient grounds for making the appointment.

THE JUDGES are at last opening their eyes to the fact that a certain proportion of litigants, perfectly well able to bear the costs of legal assistance, prefer to save their pockets by engaging the bench to unravel their cases before deciding them. The patience and consideration which the judges often display in conducting the cases

of "suitors in person" may be ascribed partly to compassion for the benighted wanderer in legal mazes, and partly, perhaps, to a keen relish for a temporary resumption of their old habits at the bar. Whatever may be the reason, however, the bench have been often by no means averse to undertake the task of ascertaining and presenting in proper shape the points of a case brought before them by a litigant who confesses that he knows no law, and respectfully stands aside while the judges argue his case for him. But it appears that there has been developed a novel, irritating, and most unwarrantable species of "suitor in person," who refuses to abide by the rules of the game; insists on having a hand in it himself, and declines to leave the matter altogether to his judicial allies. This person, dubbed by Mr. Justice STEPHEN the "half-lawyer," is found to be an intolerable nuisance; and his most irregular conduct seems likely to lead to a judicial revolt against the whole system of suitors in person. On Tuesday last, in the Divisional Court, on the hearing of an opposed motion for a new trial, Mr. Justice GROVE remarked:—"In this case the appellant has appeared in person, and this course is very inconvenient. There are many parties who do not appear in *formā pauperis*, but are well able to instruct, yet do not instruct, counsel. They take up our time, which might well be much more usefully employed. Counsel would have put the points of the case before us clearly and distinctly; here we have had very much trouble in striving to elucidate and to extricate the real legal points in issue. We believe that we have succeeded in doing so, but this labour on our part must not be taken to be a precedent. It is not our duty to find out the real points of law from amid the chaos. The real points ought to be presented to us; we should not have to find them." And Mr. Justice STEPHEN added:—"It is inconvenient enough for us when the party in person is not a lawyer, but when parties in person are 'half-lawyers,' the inconvenience is greater still. It then becomes most difficult for us to extricate the real points of law to be discussed." These observations are more particularly worthy of notice since both the above learned judges are remarkable for the pains which they bestow on the cases of litigants in person. If the judges mean to put a stop to the nuisance which has attained such dimensions of late they should follow the course adopted by the House of Lords in *McMurray v. Jackson* (28 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 611), and make a special order as to costs. In that case the House of Lords said that, "inasmuch as the appellant (who appeared in person) had throughout overlooked the points which were in his favour, and had insisted on others which were untenable, no costs of the present appeal would be allowed."

THE LORD CHANCELLOR, in receiving a deputation from the Free Land League on Tuesday last, developed at some length his views on the land question, but avoided committing himself to any general definite scheme of reform. He is not so joyously confident of having solved the problem as was his predecessor. He said that he was in favour of the abolition of the law of primogeniture, and that, in his experience, many instances of a painful character of the injustice of the working of this law had occurred in the last few years. He was also in favour of abolishing copyhold tenure as soon as possible, not only on the ground that it renders the land system of the country less simple by introducing exceptions into the general rule, but also owing to its preventing improvements. He mentioned a property where he could distinguish between the freehold and copyhold tenements owing to the state of the buildings; and we may add that in woodland counties they may readily be distinguished owing to the absence of timber on the copyholds; in the Weald "the oak shuns base land." He mentioned a case where the stewards' costs and compensation on enfranchisement amounted to over £12, while the lord's compensation was only 16s. 8d. He expressed himself in favour of considerable, though not specifying what,

limitation of the power of settling land. He thought that the question must be looked at in two ways—first, the fuller the ownership of land by the person in possession the better; and secondly, the more simple settlements are made, the easier it is to improve the transfer of land by means of registration of title. He expressed an opinion that registration of title can only be effected by contriving some scheme by which the persons whose names are on the register can be dealt with as easily as the persons in whose names Consols stand. He did not say that this was an easy thing to secure, but it was the thing to be aimed at; he indicated a preference for making the beneficial provisions by way of trust only. His remarks on the enfranchisement of leaseholds are well worthy of attention. He pointed out that sometimes those "who are anxious for one simple uniform system of enfranchisement lose sight of the fact that certain leaseholds have been granted at a rent which never otherwise would have been taken for them on the condition of buildings of a certain character being erected, the person who makes the lease having let the ground on lower terms than he would otherwise have granted, because he hoped to secure the buildings erected by reason of the lease falling in. There are, of course, cases where there is no such consideration—where at the time of the lease the land is let free from any such consideration, and the owner gets the full rent. "I think," he added, "that this difference would have to be taken into account, unless you are to do injustice in any measure introduced relating to the enfranchisement of leaseholds already granted. Of course, it is a totally different question whether you should not enact a provision by which leaseholds beyond a certain length of time are in effect prohibited." This is very much what we have always urged.

THE DIRECTORS of the various railway companies have been issuing circulars calling upon their shareholders to meet and protest against the Railway and Canal Traffic Bill, and, in particular, against that important clause of it to which we directed special attention when the Bill was first printed, whereby powers are proposed to be given to revise maximum rates. It is urged very strenuously, and in varying phraseology, that the present rates, being authorized by the Acts of Parliament under which the railways were constructed, the proposed revision will amount to a breach of faith with the shareholders who invested their property in railways on an understanding that the rates should not be revised without their consent; and the shareholders are to meet, as the Midland Railway circular puts it, "to consider the best course to be adopted in this emergency to secure the maintenance of the good faith of Parliament towards railway companies." It has been pointed out that in 1845 a Standing Order passed both Houses of Parliament, by virtue of which every railway Act passed in and after that year contains, as one of its concluding sections, a section to the effect that "nothing herein contained shall be deemed or construed to exempt the railway by this Act authorized to be made from the provisions of any general Act relating to this Act, or of any general Act relating to railways, which may hereafter pass during the present or any future session of Parliament, or from any future revision or alteration under the authority of Parliament of the maximum rates of fares and charges authorized by this Act." The words we have italicized appear for the first time in 1845. Railways Acts passed before 1845 may be divided into three classes. In the majority of cases they contain a section to the same effect as that above, with the exception only of the italicized words. Some early Acts, as, for instance, the Act authorizing the South-Eastern (6 Will. 4, c. 75), contain the very singular provision that nothing in the Act "shall exempt the railroad . . . from the provisions of any general Act for the regulation of railroads which may be passed before the expiration of one year from the passing of this Act, if Parliament shall be sitting at the expiration of such period of one year, or (if Parliament shall not then be sitting) before the end of the then next session of Parliament." In still earlier Acts, such as the Liverpool and Manchester Act (7 Geo. 4, c. 49), there is no saving clause whatever. About 2,000 miles of railway were constructed before 1845. In the majority of cases, the Acts authorizing this comparatively small portion of the railroad mileage of the country have been superseded by new Acts (passed since 1845) containing new toll clauses, and containing also, of course, the saving clause in its strongest

form. The South-Eastern and London and South-Western Acts afford the principal exceptions to this almost universal rule, and parts of the systems of these two companies are still worked under Acts containing the saving clause in its weakest form.

## SERVICE OF WRITS OUT OF THE JURISDICTION.

### I.

In a recent issue we discussed the broad, general principles which underlie the question of security for costs when it is required from plaintiffs non-resident within the jurisdiction. This is practically the only point in our English procedure which affects foreign plaintiffs in our courts. Subject to this rule as to giving security, the English courts are open alike to subjects and aliens, persons domiciled in, and persons domiciled beyond the jurisdiction of the territory of the United Kingdom. So long as the defendant is within that jurisdiction at the time of the service of the writ, it matters not what the cause of action is, nor where it arose, nor what the law which must be applied to settle it. There is but one exception to this general rule, which may be stated thus: The English courts decline jurisdiction in suits relating to land situate in a foreign country; but even this would seem to be limited to suits relating to the title of such land, for actions for rent of real property abroad have been frequently heard and determined in England.

But foreigners and persons not domiciled nor usually resident within the jurisdiction are affected in a very considerable degree by our practice when they are defendants in suits brought in the English courts.

There is a very old maxim of the civil law, with which we presume all our readers are perfectly familiar, *Actor sequitur forum rei*. It is to be found, we believe, in all systems of law. But whatever virtue it may have originally possessed, and however equitable the glamour of right which it throws round defendants may be, it has long been found to be exceedingly impractical, and essentially unsuited to the commercial necessities of the age we live in. Every State has consequently set its legal advisers to work to invent means of extricating its courts from the fetters which the maxim has drawn closely round their jurisdiction; and thus it is that to-day we find drawn up in almost every code of civil procedure a set of exceptions to the maxim, a statement of cases varying as much in number as in logical basis, in which non-resident defendants are declared to be subject to the jurisdiction of the courts whose procedure is regulated by the code in question. For the present we shall confine our attention to some of the general principles on which our own set of exceptions is based, and which are embodied in order 11 of the Judicature Act under the title, "Service out of the jurisdiction."

The history of this well-known order divides itself into three epochs. The first commences in 1852 with the primitive simplicity of the Common Law Procedure Act; the second in 1875 with the hideous jumble of words contained in ord. 11, r. 1, of the old Rules of Court, speedily amended by the still more hideous jumble of rule 1a.; the third in 1883, with the apparently precise schedule contained in ord. 11, r. 1, of the new Rules of Court, which, we believe, was drafted entirely by the then Lord Chancellor, Lord Selborne. How long this third epoch is destined to survive is a question whose answer can only be sought in the dim and distant courses of the future. We believe that it is full of latent defects which cases will presently make patent. Turning, however, to sections 18 and 19 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1852, the provisions contained in them seem based on the soundest common sense, free from ambiguity, and easy to be understood by the persons most interested—that is to say, non-resident foreigners. The writ, or notice of the writ, could be issued for service out of the jurisdiction either where the cause of action arose within the jurisdiction or where the cause of action was in respect of the breach of a contract made within the jurisdiction. The fundamental idea was clearly a species of imaginary submission to the law of the country by some act done within the country, either in fact or in law, which gave rise to the cause of action, and a claim by the courts to exercise jurisdiction in respect of such submission. But

what was meant by a "cause of action"? The Courts of Queen's Bench and Exchequer thought one thing; the Court of Common Pleas thought another. Here was a pretty state of things which nothing but a council of judges could put straight. The opinion of the Common Pleas prevailed, although the judges of the Queen's Bench "were of the same opinion still"; and thenceforward the converse of the second case contemplated in the above sections—namely, the breach in England of a contract made abroad—was declared to fall within their provisions. Thus the only difficult point which arose in the old practice was definitively settled.

The simple rule of 1852 was condemned to make room for the complicated and abstruse provisions of the order and rules of 1875. The most important modification then introduced was the exclusion, in certain contract cases, of defendants resident in Scotland or Ireland. There was, further, an extension of the old rule to cases which in any way affected "land, stock, or other property situate within the jurisdiction," and to certain cases where the action was brought for an injunction, presumably to save doubts being raised as to whether the claim for an injunction could, in strictness, be called a cause of action; and, finally, a separation of torts from breaches of contract, the principle of the old rule, however, being preserved, leave being granted when the tort was committed within the jurisdiction.

Lastly, we come to the changes of 1883. The partial exclusion of Scotch and Irish defendants from the rule is made (in deference to complaints coming from north of the Tweed, not altogether unreasonable nor wholly reasonable) practically complete: it is no longer limited to certain contract cases, but applies to all the cases specified in the sub-sections of rule 1, and is absolute in all contract cases. Secondly, the extension of 1875 to cases affecting property within the jurisdiction has been curtailed so as to apply only to land. The rule as to injunctions is left intact. Thirdly, the principle, as it applies to actions in tort, has been completely changed; in lieu of the commission of the tort within the jurisdiction being the test, it is now the domicil or usual residence of the *tortfeasor*, irrespective of the place of commission of the tort. Fourthly, we have a set of new principles; the ordinary jurisdiction conferred in all cases over a defendant by mere presence within the territory is extended to persons domiciled, or usually resident in the country; in a similar way it is extended to all persons who are "necessary or proper" parties to actions already begun against some other person duly served within the jurisdiction; and the jurisdiction in administration actions, and actions for the execution of trust deeds, is strictly defined. It will thus be seen how the study of this branch of practice has grown; how it has led now to curtailments, now to extensions, and, again, to curtailments of extensions; and all these changes in the procedure, which, we should have thought, required, above all things, consistency, have taken place within the short space of thirty-three years. And yet nothing can be of greater importance than that foreigners, and those who, being resident abroad, have not many facilities for studying the manifold changes in our law, should know definitely and precisely what acts of theirs will bring them within the jurisdiction of the English courts. One day it is a tort committed in England, the next it is a tort committed out of England. These things should not be. And yet, whether we do obtain hereafter a code of exceptions common to all nations or not, we are, after our third change, still far from perfection, for some further changes in order 11 seem inevitable.

At the Southwark Police Court on Tuesday, John Seymour Fowler, solicitor, and William Henry Edwards, manager of the Legal and General Mercantile Creditors' Protection Association, late of 23, High-street, Borough, were committed for trial on charges of conspiracy and fraud.

Sir Richard Garth, says the *Times* Correspondent, left India on the 25th ult., after more than ten years service as Chief Justice of Bengal. Ill-health has compelled him to retire a year before the completion of the usual term of office. In him the High Court loses an able, upright, and impartial chief, and Calcutta Society one of its most genial and popular members. Nor is it only for his judicial and social qualities that his departure is regretted; he has always been foremost in movements calculated to benefit the country, especially those connected with education. The general esteem in which he is held is strikingly reflected by the tone of a farewell address presented to him by the Bar, Solicitors, and the general native community. The subscription list opened for the purpose of providing Calcutta with some permanent memorial of him contains the names of most of the leading native noblemen of the province, and has already reached a large amount.

## THE NEW COUNTY COURT RULES.

*See also note to section of an old order relating to the subject-matter of this section.*

III.

ORDER 12, relating to Interlocutory and Interim Orders and Proceedings, incorporates, by rules 1 and 2, the provisions of R. S. C., 1883, L. 1, 2, as to the preservation or interim custody of the subject-matter of a disputed contract and order for sale of perishable goods, &c. There is, by the way, a very curious marginal note to rule 1. Rule 10 of this order, as to "order for accounts or inquiries," is a reproduction of R. S. C., 1883, XXXIII., 2.

We now come to one of the leading novelties of the new rules—the application, by order 15, of the "Omnibus" Summons for Directions of R. S. C., XXX., to County Court Practice. It is provided by ord. 15, r. 1, that, "in any action or matter, any party may, at any time, apply to the judge or registrar for a postponement of the trial (if the day of trial has been fixed) and for general directions with respect to the following matters and proceedings—particulars of claim or counter-claim, special defence, payment into court, discovery (including interrogatories), examination of witnesses before the trial, mode of trial, and any other matter or proceeding in the action or matter previous to trial; and the judge or registrar, if satisfied that, from the nature of the action or matter, the directions asked for, or some of them, are necessary, may make an order, giving directions as to all or any of such matters or proceedings as may be just, whether applied for or not, and, if necessary, postpone the trial." The next rule provides that the application for directions is to be made on three days' notice in writing to every party to the action or matter who may be affected thereby; that the notice "shall include, so far as is practicable, all or as many of the above-mentioned matters and proceedings as, having regard to the nature of the action or matter, can conveniently be dealt with by the order of the judge or registrar"; and rule 3 enables any party who has been served with notice of the application for directions to apply "for any order or directions as to any of the above-mentioned matters or proceedings which he may desire"; and the succeeding rule (4) throws the costs of any other application as to any of the above-mentioned matters or proceedings upon the person making the application, if "it shall appear to the judge or registrar that the application is one that could and ought to have been included in the general application for directions." It will be seen that we have here reproduced one of the most debatable provisions of the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883; we confess it is difficult to see how it can be to any extent necessary or advantageous in county court actions.

The next order, with regard to Discovery and Inspection, follows generally the provisions of R. S. C., 1883, XXXI. Either party to an action or matter may, *without an affidavit*, by leave of the judge or registrar, deliver interrogatories for the examination of any one or more of the opposite parties. In deciding upon the application for leave to exhibit interrogatories, the judge or registrar is to consider any offer which may be made by the party sought to be interrogated to deliver particulars, or to make admissions, or to produce documents; also whether the application has been made too early in the proceedings or too late to allow of the answers being used at the hearing; and in adjusting the costs of the action inquiry is, at the instance of any party, to be made into the propriety of exhibiting such interrogatories, and if they have been exhibited "unreasonably, vexatiously, or at improper length" the party in fault is to pay the costs (R. S. C., 1883, XXXI., 3). Discovery of documents may also now, by rule 10 of this order, be obtained without filing an affidavit. Following the principle adopted in R. S. C., 1883, the costs of discovery are, unless ordered by the judge or registrar, to be secured in the first instance by the party seeking the discovery, who is (rule 21), before delivery of the interrogatories, to pay into court 20s., and a further sum of 2s. for every folio beyond five folios; and any party seeking discovery otherwise than by interrogatories is, before making application for discovery, to pay into court 20s.

Ord. 17, rr. 1, 4—7, contain various provisions introduced from R. S. C., XVII., relating to change of parties, on which no special observation need be made.

By ord. 25, r. 50, provision is made for the issue of a warrant of delivery of property other than land or money, corresponding

generally to the writ of delivery of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, and R. S. C., 1883, XLVIII.

The old order 29, as to appeals, is now replaced by order 32, which provides simply that "appeals shall be had in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of the Supreme Court, December, 1885, made under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1884." These rules are printed in the appendix to the new County Court Rules.

Provisions are made by rules 9 and 10 of order 33 for the transfer of interpleader proceedings to county courts under section 17 of the Judicature Act, 1884.

There is a new order (47) relating to acknowledgments by married women, which provides that all alterations, interlineations, or erasures to the certificate or affidavit respectively required for the purpose of obtaining the acknowledgment of a married woman must be initialled by the registrar, who must also administer the oath to the solicitor making the affidavit.

We propose to deal subsequently with the question of costs under the new rules.

the arrears of rent will go to the specific devisee; otherwise it will fall into the general personal estate.

A LAWYER-TRUSTEE.

March 31.

#### BILLS OF SALE.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir.—The bill of sale case, *Goldstrom v. Tallerman*, reported in the *Times* of the 12th ult., heard before Justices Mathew and Smith on the 11th ult., appears to call for some notice. It purported to consist of a loan of £500, to be repaid, "together with interest then due," by "twelve equal monthly payments of £41 13s. 4d."

Mr. Justice Mathew construed it as consisting of amounts of £500 principal, and £300 interest, to be repaid by monthly instalments of £66 13s. 4d.

If this construction is correct, the transaction appears to have consisted of a loan of £500, for one month, at sixty per cent., and for each subsequent month a loan diminishing in amount, and at an increasing rate of interest, until, for the twelfth month, the loan amounted to £41 13s. 4d., at 720 per cent.

W. W. WHYTEHEAD.

10, Arundel-street, Strand, W.C., March 30.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### THE APPORTIONMENT ACT, 1870.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir.—I have read a letter of the 19th inst. from "Accountants and Trustees," commenting on the observations of mine on the Apportionment Act, 1870. I join with them in the wish that someone had written on the subject, whether agreeing or disagreeing with my observations. Perhaps I ought to assume that no one differs from my views.

Your correspondents in their concluding paragraph say there ought to be an attempt to arrive at something like a uniform view among the members of the legal profession. I would rather say it is to be desired that there should be an authoritative decision on the subject. No uniformity of views or practice can settle the construction of an Act of Parliament.

It is true that Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, in *Scholefield v. Redfern* (11 W. R. 433), acted on the existing practice, but this was in the absence of any Act of Parliament.

The opinion of a Q.C. quoted does not refer to the question whether or not the Act of 1870 has altered the practice which we all know existed before that Act. If it is the fact that this practice has generally continued since the Act—that is, that the Act has been disregarded—it will not repeal the Act. The facts upon which the counsel advised are not stated, except that they were similar to those in *Barker v. Perowne* (29 W. R. 730), and, if so, I do not think the Act came into consideration.

I do not think the "Accountants and Trustees" quite follow my remarks respecting the case of *Barker v. Perowne*. It was no part of my object in writing to enter into the application of the Act to bequests by will, and I only alluded to this subject in order to shew that this case did not affect the question of the application of the Act on changes of investment during the life of a tenant for life.

I think it is clear that if, for any purpose, it is necessary to decide what part of a testator's assets are, at the time of his death, capital, and what income, dividends on money in the funds must be apportioned in the same manner as interest on a mortgage, because the Act says so; but the effect as regards bequests is quite another question, and is so considered in the several cases I referred to. If a will bequeaths a sum of money due to the testator on a mortgage, together with the current half-year's interest, there is, of course, no apportionment, or, in other words, the apportionment to the day of death is bequeathed, as well as the capital; but if the will simply bequeaths the mortgage debt, the current half-year's interest is apportionable; and I apprehend that, under the Act in question, the same principle must be applied to a bequest of stock, so, if a will directs a specific sum of Consols to be transferred to a legatee immediately after death, the legatee would take it with the accruing dividend, but, in the case of a simple bequest of an existing sum of Consols, the current dividend would have to be apportioned.

In all cases under a will, the question what passes is one of construction, and I think it is clear, from what I stated respecting the case of *Barker v. Perowne*, that the court simply decided that, according to the construction of the will, the whole of the dividend in question passed to the legatee.

The case of *Hasluck v. Pedley* (L. R. 19 Eq. 271), decided by Jessel, M.R., exactly bears out what I have said. Speaking of a specific gift, he says, the testator may, of course, give arrears of rent, and, if so,

#### CASES OF THE WEEK.

##### COURT OF APPEAL.

**BRYANT v. READING (E. C. READING, CLAIMANT)**—C. A. No. 1, 30th March.

PRACTICE—INTERPLEADER—SUMMARY DECISION AT CHAMBERS—REFUSAL TO GRANT AN ISSUE—APPEAL FROM MASTER TO JUDGE—APPEAL TO THE COURT OF APPEAL—R. S. C., 1883, LIV., 12, 21; LVII., 8, 11.

This case raised a question as to the right of appeal in interpleader proceedings. The plaintiff obtained judgment against the defendant and issued execution for £43. The claimant, who was the defendant's wife, claimed the furniture seized by her separate property, and, on the sheriff taking out an interpleader summons, the claimant asked the master to direct an issue. The master, however, at the request of the plaintiff, decided to dispose of the matter in a summary way under ord. 57, r. 8, and refused an issue, and, for that purpose, adjourned the case for hearing before himself. The claimant appealed to Field, J., at chambers, who held that no appeal lay, as, under ord. 57, r. 11, the decision of the master was final. The Divisional Court (Grove and Stephen, J.J.), affirmed this decision. On appeal, it was contended for the claimant that, as the master had not disposed of the merits of the case, ord. 57, r. 11, did not apply, and that there was the ordinary right of appeal from a master to a judge under ord. 54, r. 21. Further, even if ord. 57, r. 11, did apply, the words, "the court or a judge," did not include a master, and so an appeal lay to the judge. It was contended for the execution creditors that there was no appeal to the Court of Appeal: *Waterhouse v. Gilbert* (L. R. 15 Q. B. D. 569, 33 W. R. Dig. 158); and, secondly, that no appeal lay from the master. The court (Lord Esham, M.R., Lindley and Lopes, L.J.) held that the Court of Appeal had no jurisdiction to hear the appeal within *Waterhouse v. Gilbert*, and that no distinction could be drawn between the decision of the master on the merits in a summary way, and his decision on a point leading to such summary decision. But, upon the question as to whether there was an appeal to the judge from a decision of the master in a summary way, Lord Esham, M.R., said that, though they could not give a judgment on the point, he did not think ord. 57, r. 11, applied to the master. Under ord. 54, r. 12, which was taken from 30 & 31 Vict. c. 68 (now repealed), a master had power to hear everything that a judge at chambers could hear, with certain exceptions, and rule 21 gave an appeal from any such decision of a master. Those rules dealt with the master only, but they did not make him "the court or a judge." They distinguished the master from "the court or a judge," which expression meant the Divisional Court or a judge at chambers. Ord. 57, r. 11, referred to "the court or a judge," and his lordship did not wish to acquiesce in the view that there was no appeal from the master to the judge at chambers. Rule 11 made the decision of the judge, whether by way of appeal from the master or not, final, and no appeal lay, as of right, to the Divisional Court. Lindley, L.J., concurred, and said that there had been a mistake made, as, in his opinion, there was an appeal from the master to the judge. Because the master was empowered to hear certain cases, he was not thereby made "the court or a judge," and ord. 54, r. 21, gave an appeal from his decision. Lopes, L.J., also agreed in thinking that the words in ord. 57, r. 11—"the decision of the court or a judge"—did not, in any way, refer to the master; and ord. 54, r. 21, gave an appeal from the master to the judge at chambers. The court, however, dismissed the appeal, on the ground that it had no jurisdiction to entertain the matter.—COUNSEL, H. D. Bonsey; GORE, SOLICITOR, A. G. Ditton.

**MIDLAND RAILWAY CO., APPELLANTS; WALTON, RESPONDENT**—C. A. No. 1, 24th March.

**PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. c. 55), ss. 150, 257—STREET EXPENSES OF PAVING—APPORTIONMENT.**

The appellants were summoned by the respondent, who was the col-

lector of the West Ham Local Board, for non-payment of £1,386, being the appellants' proportion of the expenses of paving the North Woolwich-road, under section 150 of the Public Health Act, 1875, the appellants being charged as frontagers. The North Woolwich-road was owned by the North Woolwich Land Co., who had erected bars at several places where they took sums of money from persons using the carriage-way for vehicles and cattle. Anyone paying the money could use the road, and omnibuses ran along it. On one side of a portion of the road the appellants' lines ran, and on the other side there were rows of houses and shops. The road had been in existence for thirty years, and up to the present the repairs had been done by the proprietors of the road. The money taken as tolls was not taken under the authority of any Act of Parliament, and no evidence was given as to any authority to erect the bars and take the money. The appellants contended (1) that the road was not a "street" within section 150, as the frontagers had no legal right of access to it; and (2) that they had been assessed in respect of some property not fronting the road, and that, therefore, the whole amount apportioned could not be recovered, as the local authority had no jurisdiction to assess them in respect thereof. The magistrate found that the road was not a turnpike road, but was a "street" within section 150; and also that, as the appellants were owners of some land fronting on the road, the apportionment was binding on them under section 257, as they had not disputed it within the three months. The court (Lord Esher, M.R., LINDLEY and LOPEZ, L.J.J.), affirming the decision of the Queen's Bench Division, held that the magistrate was right. The Court said that, whether this was a private or public road, it was a "street" within the meaning of section 150, as it had all the attributes of a street taken in its ordinary sense. As regards the apportionment, it was admitted that the appellants were frontagers as to some part of the property, but the complaint was that they were assessed in respect of other property not actually fronting on the street. That amounted to this, that the appellants had been assessed at too high a figure. The local authority had jurisdiction to apportion some part of the expenses to the appellants, and so they had, at the most, made a mistake in the exercise of their jurisdiction, for which a remedy was provided by sections 179 and 268. As the local authority had jurisdiction to make an apportionment, such apportionment was now conclusive under section 257, the case of *Wake v. Sheffield* (L. R. 12 Q. B. D. 142), being an authority on the point.—COUNSEL, *Jelf*, Q.C., and *Castle*; *Philbrick*, Q.C., *Wood Hill*, and *Phipson*. SOLICITORS, *Beale & Co.*; *Hillearys & Layard*.

**STANHOPE v. STANHOPE—C. A. No. 2, 25th March.**

**DIVORCE SUIT—DEATH OF PETITIONER AFTER DECREE NISI FOR DISSOLUTION, BUT BEFORE DECREE ABSOLUTE—RIGHT OF EXECUTOR TO REVIVE SUIT OR TO APPLY TO HAVE DECREE MADE ABSOLUTE—R. S. C., 1883, XVII., 1, 3.**

The question in this case was whether, when a husband has obtained a decree *nisi* for a divorce from his wife, and he dies before it is possible for him to apply to have the decree made absolute—*i.e.*, within six months from the making of the decree *nisi*—his executor is entitled to revive the suit, or to obtain leave to apply for a decree absolute. In the present case, on the 11th of May, 1883, a decree *nisi* was pronounced on the petition of a husband for the dissolution of his marriage. About two months afterwards the petitioner died, and in January, 1884, the respondent and the co-respondent married. The petitioner's father died on the 26th of June, 1881, having bequeathed £15,000 to the petitioner for life, with remainder to his wife for her life, the petitioner to have a power of appointment by will of the £15,000 on his wife's death. In 1883 the petitioner appointed the £15,000 among his brothers and sisters, he having no children. The question was raised whether the respondent was to be regarded as the widow of the petitioner, the decree *nisi* not having been made absolute before his death. If she was not his widow she would not take the life interest in the £15,000. The petitioner's executor applied for leave to revive the divorce suit, with the view of having the decree *nisi* made absolute. Sir James Hannen, P., refused the application on the ground that the matter was a purely personal one. The Court of Appeal (Corron, Bowes, and FRY, L.J.J.) affirmed the decision. Corron, L.J., said that there was no rule authorizing the revivor of a divorce suit after the death of either husband or wife, and the only authority, *Grant v. Grant* (2 S. & T. 522), was against it. "Revivor" was a thing practised in the Court of Chancery, and writs of revivor were known at common law. But revivor took place on the death of a plaintiff who was seeking to enforce some right which on his death would descend to and vest in his heir or his personal representative—when, if the transmission of interest had taken place before the commencement of the suit, the person to whom it was transmitted could himself have sued in respect of it. It would be idle after the death of a husband or wife for the survivor to institute proceedings for a dissolution of the marriage, and it would be impossible for the personal representative of the one who had died to proceed against the survivor for a dissolution. Rule 3 of order XVII. of the Rules of the Supreme Court of 1883 provided that "in case of an assignment, creation, or devolution of any estate or title *pendente lite* the cause or matter may be continued by or against the person to or upon whom such estate or title has come or devolved." In order that the action might be revived after the death of a party there must be a devolution of an estate or title which the action was brought to enforce. In his lordship's opinion the present case did not come within the principle of revivor, there being no right which devolved on anyone when the husband was dead, and the case did not come within any principle on which the court would be justified in allowing any revivor or continuance of the suit. Bowes and FRY, L.J.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, *Sir Walter Phillimore*, Q.C.,

and *Bargrave Deane*; *Bayford*, Q.C., and *Middleton*. SOLICITORS, *Hastie & Crawford*; *Levis & Lewis*.

**Re HUDSON'S TRADE-MARKS—C. A. No. 2, 27th March.**

**TRADE-MARK—REGISTRATION—MARK NOT PREVIOUSLY USED.**

In this case an important question was raised upon the construction of the Trade-Marks Registration Acts—viz., whether an entirely new mark—*i.e.*, a mark which has not prior to the application for registration been used by the applicant in his trade—can be registered under the Acts. An application was made for the registration of a new mark. Bacon, V.C., directed the registration. The Court of Appeal (Corron, Bowes, and FRY, L.J.J.) affirmed the decision. Corron, L.J., said that the application for registration having been made only two days before the Act of 1883 came into operation, he had had some doubt whether the case came under the Act of 1883 or that of 1875, but he had come to the conclusion that it was under the earlier Act, although, with regard to the main point, there was practically no difference between the Acts. The chief question was whether the Act of 1875 enabled anything to be registered as a trademark which had not been already used as such. The construction of the Act presented considerable difficulty, because the essence of a trade-mark was its having been used in connection with goods, so as to distinguish them as the goods of the person whose trade-mark was upon them. But the Act made a distinction between marks used before it as trade-marks, and marks which had not been so used, and, having regard to that distinction, it seemed as if the Act intended to give marks not used before it the position of a trade-mark if and when registered. Section 2 pointed to user, but also to the mode in which the title to trade-marks could be transmitted, and registration was to be deemed to be equivalent to public user. Section 5 presented a great difficulty, which was avoided by the Act of 1883. How could a man be "for the time being entitled to the exclusive use" of a mark if he had never had any use of it at all? The meaning of the Act of 1875, though the language was not appropriate, was that the inventor or designer of a distinctive mark or device was to be the proprietor of it, and entitled to the exclusive use of it, if there was no one who had used the mark before so that his user would be interfered with by the registration of the mark in the name of the designer. There might be a right to a trade-mark used before 1875, though the owner could not bring an action without having registered his mark. The Legislature had hardly borne in mind what was the essence of a trademark at the date of the Act. The form of application for registration which had been in use under the Act showed what had been the course of procedure. No statement of previous user had been required, except where the claim to the mark was grounded on prior user. Even if his lordship had not come to the conclusion that this construction of the Act was right, the practice had gone on for so long that he should have hesitated to adopt a different construction. Bowes, L.J., concurred. FRY, L.J., said that the Act of 1875 presented such a formidable difficulty of construction that he had doubted about its meaning in this as well as in other cases, but he had come to the conclusion that the Legislature had been minded to make a great and fundamental change in the law, and that the Act gave a new title to a trade-mark besides the title by user. The Act enabled the inventor of a trade-mark to obtain an exclusive right to it by registration.—COUNSEL, *Coxons-Hardy*, Q.C., and *Chadwyck Healey*; *Aston*, Q.C., and *Macrory*. SOLICITORS, *Bower, Cotton, & Bower*; *F. Needham*.

**HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.**

**Re BATCHELLOR, BATCHELLOR v. BATCHELLOR—Chitty, J., 31st March.**

**WILL—LIMITED POWER OF APPOINTMENT—INTENTION TO EXECUTE POWER.**

In this case the following question was raised on the will of a testator. The testator had a power to appoint, by will, a life interest to his widow, and by his will, made in 1884, after providing for the payment of his debts, and funeral and testamentary expenses, he gave, devised, and bequeathed, and, by virtue of all powers and authorities whatsoever enabling him in that behalf, appointed unto his wife all his real and personal estate and effects of whatsoever kind or nature, and wheresoever situate, for her own absolute use and benefit. An endeavour was made, on behalf of the persons interested in default of appointment, to distinguish the case from *Re Teape's Trusts* (21 W. R. 780, L. R. 16 Eq. 442). Chitty, J., said that, in principle, there was nothing in the case before him to distinguish it from *Re Teape's Trusts*, and that, in the testator's will, there was sufficient evidence of his intention to exercise his power of appointment.—COUNSEL, *Yate Lee*; *Chester*; *J. K. Young*. SOLICITORS, *Routh, Stacey, & Castle*.

**GIBSON v. WAY—Chitty, J., 30th March.**

**MARRIED WOMAN—AFTER-ACQUIRED PROPERTY—RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION—SEPARATE ESTATE.**

In this case it appeared that a testator, by his will made in 1883, gave all the residue of his real and personal estate to his daughters, Frances Georgina and Emma Augusta, in equal shares as tenants in common, for their separate use without power of anticipation. At the date of the will each of the daughters were married women, and settlements had been made at the date of each marriage. Each settlement contained a covenant to settle after-acquired property. After the death of the testator the question arose whether the residue of the testator's estate was subject to

the covenants to settle after-acquired property in the settlements of the daughters. CHITTY, J., said that the clause depriving married women of the power of anticipation was in the nature of a restraint upon the power of alienation, and held that the testator's daughters were entitled to the residue of his real and personal property, but could not bring the same into settlement under the covenants to settle after-acquired property.—COUNSEL, Spencer Bulwer and G. S. Barnes. SOLICITORS, Currey, Villiers, & Currey.

*Re* WILSON, WILSON v. CROSSE—Pearson, J., 22nd March.

WILL—CODICIL—REVOCATION—CHARGE OF LEGACIES ON REAL ESTATE.

In this case the question was whether legacies bequeathed by a codicil were charged on the testator's real estate, there being in the will an express charge on the real estate of the legacies thereby bequeathed, but there being no express charge in the codicil. The testator devised all his real estate unto and to the use of trustees in fee, upon the trusts following—viz., upon trust in the first place with or out of the rents and profits of the devised estates to satisfy the annuities therein-after bequeathed, and by selling, mortgaging, or charging the same, or a competent part or parts thereof, or by all or any of those means, in such manner as the trustees should think expedient, to satisfy the pecuniary legacies therein-after bequeathed and subject thereto, in trust for and to permit the testator's son, W., and his assigns to enjoy the devised estates during his life, without impeachment of waste, and after the decease of W. in trust for his first and other sons successively in tail male, with remainders over in trust for other issue of the testator in strict settlement. The testator then bequeathed annuities and legacies to some of his sons and daughters and to other persons, subject, in the case of each son and daughter, to a proviso that the annuitant or legatee should not be at the time entitled in possession to the residue of the testator's real estate under the limitations therein-before contained. And he directed that (except where otherwise directed) no legacy should be claimed by any legatee for two years from his decease, but that such legacies should, after the expiration of one year from his decease, bear interest at five per cent. per annum from the expiration of the said year until paid. By the codicil the testator, after reciting the provisions of the will, and in particular the trust for raising the pecuniary legacies out of his real estate, revoked a number of the annuities and legacies bequeathed by the will, and bequeathed annuities and legacies of different amounts to some of the same persons, and also bequeathed some annuities and legacies to persons to whom none had been bequeathed by the will. And he declared that the several annuities bequeathed by the codicil should be raised in the mode directed by the will, and commence from the day of his decease and be payable half-yearly, save where otherwise directed. There was no similar direction with regard to the legacies bequeathed by the codicil, but there was a declaration that the legacies to his sons and daughters were subject to the proviso as to each of them not being entitled in possession to the residue of his real estate under the limitations contained in the will. And he directed that no legacy should be due to or vested in any legatee for a period of one year from his death, but that any married legatee who should die before the period of vesting should have power to dispose, by will, of the amount of his or her legacy to his or her wife or husband and children. And he directed that the duty on all legacies and annuities subject to duty should be paid out of his estate. And in all other respects he confirmed his will. The question was whether the pecuniary legacies bequeathed by the codicil were charged on the testator's real estate in the same way as those legacies which were bequeathed by the will had been charged. PEARSON, J., held that they were. He thought that the legacies given by the codicil were substituted for those which had been given by the will, and that they were to be raised in the same way, the trust in the will for raising legacies not being revoked. This view was confirmed by the proviso that a legatee who was in possession of the real estate was not to have his or her legacy, for it was reasonable that a person who took the estate on which the legacy was charged should not also be entitled to the legacy which was charged on it. This construction was also confirmed by the direction to pay the legacy duty out of the testator's estate, for the codicil did not, in any way, deal with his general personal estate. His lordship thought that the duty on the legacies was to be paid out of the real estate, and, if so, it was impossible to suppose that the legacies themselves were not to be paid out of the real estate. The fact that the testator confirmed his will in all other respects led to the same conclusion.—COURT, Higgins, Q.C., and Ashton Cross; Everitt, Q.C., and Rawlinson; E. Beaumont. SOLICITORS, Lowless & Co.; Crosse & Sons.

SAUL v. PATTINSON—Pearson, J., 29th March.

TRUSTEE—DISCRETIONARY POWER—RELEASE OR SUSPENSION—MORTGAGE—FORECLOSURE ACTION—ORDER FOR SALE AND FORECLOSURE IN CASE NO. SALE EFFECTED.

This was a foreclosure action, the main question being whether trustees, who have a discretionary power as to the application of income, can release or suspend their right to exercise that power, either expressly or by conduct. The mortgaged property comprised real estate belonging to the mortgagors (a husband and wife), and also some real estate which was, in fact, subject to the trusts of their marriage settlement, but which they purported to convey as owners in fee. The trustees of the settlement had allowed them to have possession of the settlement and the title deeds of the property, and they concealed the existence of the settlement from the mortgagee. By the settlement, the real estate comprised in it was vested

in trustees, on trust, during the joint lives of husband and wife, to pay the income to the wife for her life, for her separate use without power of anticipation, and, after the death of either husband or wife, to pay the income to the survivor for his or her life, provided that, if the husband should be the survivor, the trustees should have power at their option to withhold payment of the income to him, and to apply it as they should think proper for the benefit of himself or his children (if any). After the death of the survivor of husband and wife, the property was limited to other uses. Since the execution of the mortgage, new trustees of the settlement had been appointed. The wife was dead. The plaintiff claimed to be entitled to have the mortgage treated as including the whole life estate of the husband, free from the discretionary power as to the application of the income. And it was contended that the original trustees had, by their conduct, enabled the husband and wife to suppress the settlement, and had thus assented to the mortgage, and that, consequently, they had deprived themselves and their successors in the office of trustee of the right to exercise, as against the mortgagee, the discretionary power as to the application of the income, and that they must be treated as having released the power or agreed to suspend its operation. Smith v. Houlton (26 Beav. 482) and Coffin v. Cooper (2 D. & S. 365) were cited as showing that such a power can be released. PEARSON, J., said that, in those cases, the discretionary power was not given to trustees, and was not in the nature of a trust. It was given to a tenant for life who had an interest. In the present case the power was in the nature of a trust, and it was no more capable of being released than any of the trusts of the settlement. Weller v. Ker (L. R. 1 Sc. App. 11) was a distinct authority for that. The trustees could not by any possibility release the power, and they were bound to exercise it to the best of their ability. His lordship made an order for the sale of the property comprised in the mortgage, and for foreclosure in case a sale should not be effected.—COUNSEL, Everitt, Q.C., and Stock; Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., and Darley; C. Walker; Carson. SOLICITORS, Ullithorne, Currey, & Villiers; Gray & Mounsey; R. Plews.

ARCHER v. ARCHER—Pearson, J., 25th March.

JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 25 (8)—R. S. C., 1883, L. 3, 6—EQUITABLE EXECUTION—HUSBAND AND WIFE—MAGISTRATE'S ORDER FOR MAINTENANCE OF WIFE—DEFAULT IN PAYMENT BY HUSBAND—INJUNCTION TO RESTRAIN PAYMENT OF LEGACY TO HUSBAND.

This action was brought by a wife against her husband and the executors of a testator, under whose will the husband was entitled to a legacy of £100, claiming payment out of the legacy of a sum of £70, the arrears due to the plaintiff under a magistrate's order which she had obtained, under section 4 of 41 & 42 Vict. c. 19, for the payment to her by her husband of a weekly allowance of 9s. for her maintenance. The husband had failed to make the payments and had gone away to America. The plaintiff applied *ex parte* for leave to serve the writ on the husband out of the jurisdiction, and for an injunction to restrain the executors from paying the legacy to the husband. PEARSON, J., gave leave to serve the writ on the husband out of the jurisdiction, and, on the authority of Westhead v. Riley (L. R. 25 Ch. D. 413) and Coney v. Bennett (L. R. 29 Ch. D. 993), he granted the injunction asked for until a week after the time limited for the husband's appearance.—COUNSEL, McSwinney. SOLICITORS, Plunkett & Leader.

MANN v. THE PATENT CABLE TRAMWAYS CORPORATION—Pearson, J., 26th March.

COMPANY—MORTGAGE OF SHARES—INJUNCTION TO RESTRAIN COLLUSIVE TRANSFER.

This was a motion for an injunction to restrain the defendant corporation from transferring 500 shares, which they held in another company called the Edinburgh Northern Tramways Company, which was incorporated by an Act of Parliament passed in 1884. The plaintiffs had acted, one as the solicitor, and the other as the engineer, to the promoters of the Bill. The Act provided that the preliminary costs should be paid by the company. After it was passed an agreement, dated the 24th of October, 1884, was made between the company and the defendant corporation, by which the latter were to purchase land and construct the works required for the company, and to pay the preliminary expenses of obtaining the Act, in consideration of a sum of £93,000, £5,000 of which was to be paid by the issue of 500 paid-up £10 shares in the company to the corporation. Another agreement, dated the 25th of October, 1884, was made between the corporation and the plaintiffs for the payment to them of £17,000 in satisfaction of their professional costs and charges in connection with the passing of the Act. Of that sum, £5,000 was to be paid in cash, and £8,500 in debentures of the corporation, which were to be secured on all moneys, shares, and other securities of the company, to which the corporation might be entitled. In pursuance of the first agreement, 500 £10 shares of the company had been transferred into the names of five nominees of the corporation. The plaintiffs had under the second agreement received the £5,000 cash, but they had not had any shares of the company transferred to them or any debentures of the corporation issued to them. The defendant corporation had taken steps to have most of the 500 shares in the company, which were held by their five nominees, transferred into the names of nineteen other persons so as to have twenty-four shareholders altogether. No other shares of the company had been issued. The plaintiffs alleged that this was done in order to get a meeting of shareholders of the company and collusively to put an end to the agreement of the 24th of October, 1884. The action was brought for specific performance of the agreement of the 25th of October, 1884, and for an injunction to restrain the transfer or dealing with the

500 shares of the company, or the votes at meetings of the company, so as to prejudice the plaintiffs' security. The defendant corporation sought to impeach both the agreements. They pleaded that the second agreement was *ultra vires*, and counter-claimed to have it set aside on the ground of misrepresentation, if it was not void as being *ultra vires*. They had also commenced proceedings in Scotland, since the commencement of this action, to have their agreement with the tramways company set aside. PEARSON, J., said that he would not express any opinion on the merits of the Scotch action. He had not been told of anything which made it necessary that any meeting of the shareholders in the company should be held. The action in Scotland could proceed and be properly decided without such a meeting. He should grant an injunction, giving either party liberty to apply when that action should be decided.—COUNSEL, *Cowens-Hardy, Q.C.*, and *Methold; Higgins, Q.C.*, and *Maclean, SOLICITORS, A. W. Rixon; Linklater & Co.*

**CONSTABLE v. CONSTABLE**—Pearson, J., 26th March.

**SETTLED LAND ACT, 1882, s. 2 (8)—TRUSTEE FOR PURPOSES OF ACT—TRUSTEE WITH POWER OF SALE WITH CONSENT OF TENANT FOR LIFE.**

This was a summons for the appointment of trustees of a will for the purposes of the Act, the object being to enable the tenant for life to sell some heirlooms. The applicant was the sole trustee of the will, under which he had a power of sale with the consent of the tenant for life. The will did not give the trustee power to sell the heirlooms. Section 2 (8) of the Act provides that "the persons (if any) who are for the time being, under a settlement, trustees with power of sale of settled land, or with power of consent to, or approval of, the exercise of such a power of sale . . . are, for purposes of this Act, trustees of the settlement." PEARSON, J., held that the applicant was a trustee of the will for the purposes of the Act within the definition contained in section 2 (8), and that his trusteeship extended to the heirlooms, though the will gave no power to sell them. The Act gave power to sell them. It was not necessary, therefore, to appoint trustees.—COUNSEL, *Everitt, Q.C.*, and *Nalder; Higgins, Q.C.*, and *Yate Lee; Stillwell, SOLICITORS, Collyer-Bristow & Co.; Bell, Steward, & Co.; Slaughter & Colegrave.*

**Re ANGLO-AFRICAN STEAMSHIP CO. (LIMITED)**—Kay, J., 25th March.

**PRACTICE—COMPANY—WINDING UP—ORDER FOR PAYMENT OF CALLS—SERVICE THROUGH THE POST ON PERSONS RESIDENT OUT OF THE JURISDICTION—WINDING-UP ACT, 1848—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, s. 62—GEN. ORD., NOV., 1862, n. 63.**

In this case the question was whether the court had jurisdiction to make an order for service through the post out of the jurisdiction of orders made in the winding up of a company. An application was made in the above matter on behalf of the official liquidator for leave to serve through the post an order made in the winding up of the company for the payment of calls on certain persons resident out of the jurisdiction, at Lagos and other places on the West Coast of Africa. KAY, J., said that he could not see his way to make the order. As he understood the matter, there was no section at all in the Winding-up Acts authorizing service either of notices or of balance orders, which were equivalent to notices, upon persons residing out of the jurisdiction, and whereas in the Winding-up Act, 1848 (11 & 12 Vict. c. 45), there was a provision that service of summonses and notices and the like by post should be sufficient on a person whether within or out of the jurisdiction, the Companies Act, 1862, omitted that provision and repealed the Act of 1848. It seemed, therefore, that the Legislature designedly omitted the provision that service by the post should be effectual in the case of persons out of jurisdiction. His lordship, therefore, refused the application, but allowed the liquidator his costs out of the company's assets.—COUNSEL, *H. Harvell, SOLICITORS, Rose-Innes, Son, & Crick.*

**POLLEXFEN v. GIBSON**—Q. B. Div., 25th March.

**PRACTICE—SERVICE OF WRIT ON PARTNER WITHIN JURISDICTION—FIRM OUT OF JURISDICTION.**

In this case a writ had been issued against a firm resident in the United States. A member of the firm happening to come to England, service of the writ was effected on him while in this country. The writ was an ordinary eight days writ, and it was contended that this proceeding was improper, and that leave should have been obtained to serve the writ out of the jurisdiction as it was impossible for the other members of the firm to appear within eight days. The court held that the writ and service were good. MATHREW, J., said that by R. S. C., 1883, IX., 6, a writ may be served upon any one or more of the partners in a firm, and that those words apply to foreign, as well as to English partnerships, and that the note to the forms of writ 5, 6, and 7 in Appendix A. to the orders and rules did not militate against this view. These forms are intended to be used where defendants are out of the jurisdiction and it is desired to serve those defendants out of the jurisdiction. A. L. SMITH, J., concurred, and observed that though judgment on such a writ would be against the firm, execution could only issue against the individual member.—COUNSEL, *Burnes, J. Edy, SOLICITORS, J. & R. Cole; Stibbard, Gibson, & Co.*

**MANCHESTER GUARDIANS v. ORMSKIRK UNION**—Q. B. Div., 26th March.

**POOR LAW—IRREMOVABILITY—BREAK OF RESIDENCE.**

In this case the pauper had entered into the employ of the trustees of

the Manchester Royal Infirmary as a nurse. By the terms of her engagement she was required to undertake whatever duties the superintendent of the hospital might order, whether in a private house or hospital. She lived at the infirmary at Manchester from 1873 to 1878 continuously, with the exception of two breaks. In 1876 and 1877 she was required by the authorities at the infirmary to undertake certain fever cases at a hospital outside the township of Manchester. Her duties kept her there five months on the first occasion and three months on the second. While she was absent her effects remained in the Manchester Infirmary. She was paid from there, and she returned thither after her duties at the fever hospital were ended. The court held that there had been no break of residence. MATHREW, J., said that, from the facts stated, it was clear that there had been no intention on the part of the pauper to begin any other residence outside Manchester. The absences referred to were not for the purpose of gaining a residence at the fever hospital, but for the purpose of fulfilling her contract entered into at the Manchester Infirmary. A. L. SMITH, J., was of the same opinion, and pointed out that in *Reg. v. Stapleton* (1 E. & B. 766) the pauper had contracted to leave a certain parish and not to return, and that in *Reg. v. Worcester Union* (22 W. R. 572) the pauper had begun a new residence in another parish.—COUNSEL, *Addison, Q.C.; Smyly, SOLICITORS, Johnson & Weatherall, for Lings, Manchester; Gregory, Rowcliffe, & Co., for Parr, Sadler, & Co., Ormskirk.*

**IN THE GOODS OF GOSLING—P. D. & A. DIV., 30th March.**

**WILL—CODICIL—REVOCATION—ERASURE—DOCUMENT EXECUTED WITH Formalities of WILL—WILLS ACT, 1837 (1 VICT. c. 20), s. 20.**

This case raised a question as to the revocation of a codicil. The deceased executed a will on the 12th of June, 1880, and on the 10th of October, 1880, he duly executed a codicil, which was written out and signed on the back of the will. He afterwards executed four other codicils to his will, in none of which was there any reference to the codicil of the 10th of October, 1880. After his death the will and the four later codicils were found in the same condition as at the date of their execution, but the first codicil had several thick lines and flourishes drawn across it, and at the foot of the document were the signatures of the testator and of two witnesses, whose signatures followed the words, "We are witnesses to the erasure of the above, October 10, 1881." It appeared from the affidavits of the two witnesses that they had seen the testator sign this memorandum, and that they had signed their names in his presence and in the presence of each other. An application was now made for probate of the will and the four later codicils only, on the ground that there had been a valid revocation of the first codicil within section 20 of the Wills Act, 1837, and reference was made to *De Pontis v. Kendall* (10 W. R. 69, 30 Beav. 572), where Lord Romilly said that, since the statute, "a will can only be revoked by marriage, by express declaration in writing, or by burning, &c. By express declaration I do not mean that the words must be, 'I do declare that I intend to revoke my will,' but that any equivalent words which amount to that would be sufficient." BURR, J., said that the Act provided that a testamentary document might be revoked "by some writing declaring an intention to revoke the same, and executed in the manner in which a will is hereinbefore required to be executed." In the present case the testator's intention was so obvious that, if not within the letter, there had been a revocation within the spirit of the Act. The first codicil must, therefore, be excluded from the probate.—COUNSEL, *R. H. Pritchard, SOLICITOR, W. T. Elliott.*

**CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS.**

**Re DEAN, WARD v. HOLMES**—Kay, J., 29th March.

**SOLICITOR—COSTS OF ABORTIVE SALE—TAXATION—SOLICITORS' REMUNERATION ACT, 1881 (44 & 45 VICT. c. 44)—GEN. ORD., AUGUST, 1882, n. 2, SUB-SECTION (e); SCHEDULE I., PART 1, n. 2.**

The question in this case was whether the taxing-master was right in his refusal to tax so much of a bill of costs as related to an abortive sale. Certain property had been put up for sale by trustees, but such sale had proved abortive. The trustees were about to retire, and an order had been made in this action for the taxation of costs. The taxing-master refused to tax the items in the bill of costs of the solicitor to the trustees relating to the abortive sale, on the ground that, under the Solicitors' Remuneration Act, 1881 (44 & 45 Vict. c. 44), and Schedule I., part 1, r. 2 of the General Order thereunder, costs would become chargeable in respect of such abortive sale should an effectual sale be hereafter effected. It had been specifically stated before the taxing-master that the new trustees intended to employ a new solicitor. KAY, J., said that the new solicitor could never obtain any costs of the abortive sale, the rule in question only applied to "the same solicitor"; the items in dispute must, therefore, be referred back to the taxing-master for taxation, and must be dealt with under rule 2, sub-section (e), of the General Order.—COUNSEL, *Graham Hastings, Q.C., and Dunning; Cary, SOLICITORS, Bell, Brodribb, & Gray; Pitman & Sons.*

**Re RUSSELL, SON, & SCOTT**—Kay, J., 29th March.

This was a summons adjourned into court in reference to a bill of costs which Messrs Russell, Son, & Scott, a firm of solicitors, had made out and delivered to their client, Mr. Wallis, a solicitor, who was plaintiff in an action of *Wallis v. Smith*. Upon taxation of the bill the taxing master allowed certain items which were objected to by Mr. Wallis, and in particular

certain fees paid to the senior and junior counsel in the action. The summons was for the purpose, in effect, of having the taxation reviewed; and evidence was given by affidavit in reference to the objections taken by Mr. Wallis, and on the part of Messrs. Russell, Son, & Scott, for the purpose of justifying the payments. Mr. Wallis desired to cross-examine the deponents upon these affidavits, and Kay, J., thought that the better course would be that the cross-examination should take place and the matter be disposed of in court. The cross-examination accordingly took place, and Mr. Russell, of the firm of Russell & Co., and the clerks to the senior and junior counsel, were successively cross-examined by Mr. Wallis for the purpose of ascertaining the circumstances under which the fees to the counsel were paid; the allegation made by Mr. Wallis apparently being that, by some arrangement, the fees to counsel had been increased, and extra refreshers paid in order to swell the bill of costs.—KAY, J., in delivering judgment, said that the time of the Court had been for about two hours wasted over a wretched squabble. The cross-examination had taken place in court, because it had appeared to his lordship that a very great abuse might be made of the power to cross-examine out of court. His lordship referred to the proceedings in the action of *Wallis v. Smith*, and stated that an objection was originally taken to the bill of costs because it included a lump sum which it had been agreed should be received by Messrs. Russell in respect of a part of their costs. That objection was of a technical nature, being that by virtue of a recent Act of Parliament such an agreement could only be made with certain formalities which had not been observed. The objection was allowed, and a bill of the items in respect of which the lump sum was agreed to be paid was made out and delivered for taxation. Mr. Wallis objected to the taxing-master entertaining this bill, and he contended that the agreement for the lump sum having been held to be invalid, the firm had lost their right to recover the costs altogether. His lordship said he could not allow such an objection to prevail. He would not hold that solicitors were not to be paid costs because there was an agreement as to the mode of payment which was not binding for want of formalities. The case of *Re Tillard* (32 Beav. 476) was an authority upon the question which was relied on by the taxing master; but Mr. Wallis had not thought fit to refer to it. It would be a monstrous injustice to say that these solicitors should not make charges at all in regard to the lump sum. The taxing master properly considered the items, and, in opposition to Mr. Wallis's objections, allowed them. Mr. Wallis further imputed to Messrs. Russell & Co. that they had improperly swelled their bill of costs. He said that they had acted fraudulently—that representation was made by him again and again—that they had made payments to counsel which they had no right to make. That was a serious charge. It was made before the taxing master, who required affidavits justifying the payments. Affidavits were made accordingly, and they showed clearly what was done in reference to the fees which were paid. They were paid before the taxation took place, and there was no trace of fraud or improper conduct of any kind. It was a simple, *bond fide* transaction, and the examination of the witnesses in court justified every one of the payments made for fees. His lordship must express his deep regret that a gentleman belonging to an honourable profession should have brought such a charge on such materials against a brother solicitor. The case attempted to be made out failed altogether. The taxing-master acted rightly. There was nothing before him or before the court which could in any way discredit Messrs. Russell & Co. The summons was dismissed with costs.—*Times*.

## SOCIETIES.

### LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The annual meeting of proprietors was held at the offices, 126, Chancery-lane, on the 25th ult., Mr. JAMES CUDDON, the chairman, presiding.

Mr. FRANK McGEDY (the Actuary and Secretary) having read the notice convening the meeting, and the minutes of the preceding general meeting, the director's report, was taken as read:—

The report states that in the fire department the number of new insurances effected during the year was 8,214, for an aggregate sum insured of £7,093,065, yielding in new premiums the sum of £11,080 8s. 9d.

In the life department during the same period, 243 policies were effected, insuring £277,780, the new premiums upon which amounted to £8,585 11s. 5d., of which £2,685 1s. 1d. was paid away for re-assurance. Twenty proposals for insuring £19,350 were declined, and sixty-seven proposals for insuring £52,187 were uncompleted in the year.

Fourteen life annuities for £537 5s. 6d. per annum were granted, the purchase-money for which amounted to £5,790 12s. 8d., and one survivorship annuity was also granted, at an annual premium of £48 9s. 2d. Eleven annuities for £477 4s. 2d per annum became void by death during the year.

The claims under life policies were below the expectation, and were less than those of the year 1884 by the sum of £3,333 8s. 9d.

The fire losses were much below those of the last preceding year, being about 33 per cent. of the net premiums received in the year.

The average rate of interest realized on the whole of the assets of the company was 4*10s.* 9*d.* per cent. (free of income tax.)

The surplus for the year in the fire department is £19,847 12s. 4d., one-fifth whereof, namely £3,989 10s. 6d., has been added to the fire insurance fund, in accordance with the terms of the deed of settlement, and the remaining four-fifths, £15,878 1s. 10d., have been carried to credit of profit and loss account.

The balance on this account at the close of the year was £45,372 16s. 4d. The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, I feel confident that you will all consider the operations of the past financial year, as exhibited by the accounts before you, to have been eminently satisfactory. Though the new premiums in the fire department are a little less than in the preceding year, yet they are large, and indeed much above the average of the new yearly business during the last quinquennium, while as to losses we have been very fortunate. I have been looking into the fire accounts from the commencement of the company, and I find no year in which the profit has been as much as in the past year. The fire reserve fund has received an addition during the past year of nearly £4,000, and this fund, I am glad to observe, now stand at very nearly £50,000, which exceeds one whole year's net premiums, and this is considered to be an exceedingly satisfactory and ample reserve. In the life department the amount paid away for re-assurance has increased. This is occasioned by a policy having been issued for a large amount at a single premium. This payment for re-assurances, however, is by no means unproductive, because we generally receive some re-assurances from the other office in return, though not perhaps immediately. The surrenders and losses, as in other years, cause a considerable diminution of the yearly life premiums, but it must be remembered that surrenders and lapsed policies are not without profit to the company. The cessation of premiums in respect of policies which become claims during any year, and also in respect of lapsed and surrendered policies, renders it important to have a good amount of new business, not only to supply those premiums which have so ceased, but also to increase the life premium income; and, while thanking you for your valuable assistance hitherto, I ask you to continue to support the office by the introduction of as much new business as possible. The life losses as well as the fire losses during the past year have been considerably under the expectation, the total result being quite favourable as to the year's surplus. You will no doubt remember that in 1884 the directors were advised to write off £5,000 for possible depreciation in investment values. This has been done, and accordingly the proper proportions have been set down to the life insurance fund account and the shareholders' account. During the past year eight reversions to the amount of about £15,800 have fallen in. Almost all the insurance companies are supposed to have some Irish securities, which are now out of favour with the public, and therefore I think it expedient to state how we stand in this respect. The whole amount of our Irish securities is only about £22,000. Out of this amount the sum of £10,000, or thereabouts, is invested on a mortgage of good freehold ground-rents in Dublin, of sufficient amount to make it a safe security. £12,000 of the £22,000 is made up of several mortgages, some in land, some of annuities payable out of land, all protected by life policies, the income of the mortgaged property received being sufficient to pay interest at a fair rate and the insurance premiums. We are, therefore, under no apprehension as to our few Irish securities, but we are not taking now any fresh securities in Ireland. During the past year we have expended £390 for agency extension, and we have appointed 57 new agents. The only further remark which it occurs to me to make on the accounts is on the profit and loss account which has to its credit upwards of £45,000. Out of that sum we recommend that £20,000 be taken to pay the dividend of 4*s.* per share for 1886, being the same as was paid last year, so carrying forward upwards of £25,000. This line of very prudent policy, being one which has the effect of providing funds for any unfavourable year, with a view to preventing in such a case any alteration in the dividend, was fully approved of at the last general meeting. I am sorry to announce that since our last meeting we have unhappily sustained the loss of Mr. Crossman, an active and influential director, from a lamentable accident at sea during the vacation, a loss which we all greatly deplore. I regret also to state that within the past week we have lost an esteemed and influential country director, through the death of Mr. Salmon, of Diss, Norfolk. If any gentlemen should wish to ask for any further information I should be pleased to answer their questions as clearly as is in my power, and I will conclude by moving the adoption of the report.

Mr. F. R. WARD, in the absence of Mr. Pemberton, the deputy-chairman, from indisposition, seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

Mr. R. W. ROBERTS moved the following resolution: "That, in accordance with the recommendation of the directors in their report now read, a dividend of 4*s.* per share, free of income tax, be paid to the shareholders for the financial year ending on the 30th November, 1886, in equal half-yearly instalments, on the 1st day of June and the 1st day of December."

Mr. JOHN Root seconded the resolution, and said it was satisfactory to know that in these critical times the company was in a position to maintain the same dividend as last year.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

On the motion of Mr. EDMUND JAMES, seconded by Mr. HARCOURT MASTER, the directors retiring by rotation were severally and separately re-elected.

Mr. THEODORE WATERHOUSE, auditor on behalf of the shareholders, was re-elected.

THE CHAIRMAN announced on the part of the board that Mr. James J. Darley had been appointed an auditor for the ensuing year.

On the motion of Mr. W. F. NETTLESHIP, seconded by Mr. CHARLES CHADWICK, the sum of seventy-five guineas each was voted to the auditors for their services during the past year.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I now beg to move a vote of thanks to Mr. McGedy (the actuary and secretary), to the solicitors, auditors, and staff of the office, for their earnest and assiduous attention to the business during the past year. I am quite sure that no gentlemen could perform their duties

April 3, 1886.

## THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

373

with greater pains or greater exactness than these do, and I believe you all feel that such is the case. I might also, without being invidious, refer to the services of Mr. Rogers, which all the directors highly appreciate.

Mr. JOHN Root seconded the resolution which was cordially adopted.

Mr. McGEDY.—Gentlemen, on my own behalf, and on behalf of the staff, I return you my grateful thanks for this renewed mark of your appreciation of our services.

Mr. MARK WATERS (solicitor).—On behalf of myself and partners, I thank you for your vote of thanks. As representing a company composed of gentlemen in the same profession as ourselves, we are deeply anxious to obtain their approval of everything we do on their behalf, and I consider it a great honour to have succeeded in obtaining their approbation. I need hardly say that in the future, as in the past, we shall, as solicitors, shareholders, and supporters of this office, do all we possibly can to promote its progress and prosperity.

Mr. HENRY MASON, in proposing a vote of thanks to the chairman, referred to that gentleman's services as invaluable, and hoped he might be spared for many years to receive a similar vote on these occasions.

The motion was seconded simultaneously by several shareholders, and carried by acclamation.

THE CHAIRMAN.—I thank you all very much for your kind expressions towards me. I am sure they are much too flattering. I can only say that I shall continue as far as I can, and as long as I am in this position, to do all I possibly can for the advantage of the company. I receive the greatest assistance from all my fellow directors, the secretary, and others, without whom I could really do nothing.

The meeting then separated.

## LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. ARTHUR DENMAN, barrister, has been appointed Prosecuting Counsel to the Mint for the borough of Birmingham, in succession to Mr. John Henry Etherington Smith, resigned. Mr. Denman is the second son of Mr. Justice Denman, and was born in 1857. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in June, 1883, and he practises on the Midland Circuit and at the Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, and Birmingham Sessions.

Mr. CHARLES ATKINS COLLINS, solicitor, of Trowbridge, has been appointed Registrar of the Bradford and Trowbridge County Courts (Circuit No. 52), in succession to his partner, the late Mr. Henry Clark. Mr. Collins was admitted a solicitor in 1848. He is clerk to the county magistrates at Trowbridge.

Sir GEORGE EDWARD SHERSTON BAKER, Baronet, who has been appointed Recorder of the borough of Helston, in succession to the late Mr. George Frederick Speke, was born in 1846. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1871, and he practises on the Western Circuit, and at the Somersetshire, Bath, and Bristol Sessions. He is a member of the staff of the WEEKLY REPORTER.

Sir WILLIAMS CUNLIFFE BROOKS, Baronet, who has been elected M.P. for the Altringham Division of Cheshire in the Conservative interest, is the eldest son of Mr. Samuel Brooks, of Manchester, and was born in 1819. He was educated at Rugby and at St. John's College, Cambridge, as a senior optime in 1842. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1848, and he formerly practised on the Northern Circuit. He was M.P. for East Cheshire from 1868 till 1885, and he was created a baronet a few weeks ago. Sir W. Brooks is a magistrate for Lancashire and the City of Manchester.

Mr. DANIEL PELLATT, solicitor, of Banbury, has been elected Clerk of the Peace for that borough, in succession to his father, the late Mr. Daniel Parker Pellatt. Mr. D. Pellatt was admitted a solicitor in 1884.

The Right Hon. JAMES STANSFIELD, barrister, M.P., who has been appointed President of the Local Government Board, is the only son of Mr. James Stansfeld, barrister, many years a judge of county courts, and was born in 1820. He was educated at University College, London, and he graduated B.A., of the University of London in 1840, and LL.B. in 1844. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Hilary Term, 1849. Mr. Stansfeld has been M.P. for Halifax in the Liberal interest, since 1859. He was a civil lord of the Admiralty in 1864, and Under-Secretary of State for India in the following year. He was appointed a lord of the Treasury in 1868, and in the following year he became financial secretary to the Treasury. He was president of the Local Government Board from 1871 till 1874.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY BRERETON, barrister, has been appointed Standing Counsel in London to the Government of China. Mr. Brereton was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in June, 1885.

Sir CHARLES JAMES JESSEL, Bart., has been appointed a Deputy-Lieutenant for the county of Kent. Sir C. Jessel is the eldest son of the Right Hon. Sir George Jessel, late Master of the Rolls. He was born in 1860, and he was created a baronet upon his father's death in 1883. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in Jurisprudence in 1882, and he was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in April, 1885.

Mr. JOSEPH CHALLINOR, solicitor, of Leek, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Derbyshire (Mr. Chandos Pole Gell) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Challinor is clerk to the Deputy-Lieutenants for the Totmonslow Division of Staffordshire. He was admitted a solicitor in 1849.

Mr. FRANCIS DARWIN HUISH, solicitor, of Derby and Long Eaton, has been appointed Clerk to the Long Eaton Local Board, in succession to the late Mr. John Black. Mr. Huish was admitted a solicitor in 1872. He is clerk to the county magistrates for the Smalley Division.

Mr. CHARLES FLETCHER D'ANYERS ORRED, barrister, has been appointed Private Secretary to the president of the Local Government Board. Mr. Orred is the third son of Mr. George Orred, of Tranmere, Cheshire, and was born in 1847. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in January, 1880.

Mr. GEORGE PARR, solicitor (of the firm of Butlin & Parr), of Nottingham, has been appointed by the High-Sheriff of Nottinghamshire (Mr. Henry Abel Smith) to be Under-Sheriff of that county for the ensuing year. Mr. Parr was admitted a solicitor in 1867.

## THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE CERTIFICATE DUTY.

The following is the Bill which has been introduced by Mr. O'Hea for this purpose:—

A Bill to repeal the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty.

*Preamble*.—*16 & 17 Vict. c. 63.] Whereas by an Act passed in the sixteenth and seventeenth years of the reign of her Majesty Queen Victoria, intituled "An Act to repeal certain stamp duties and to grant others in lieu thereof, to give relief with respect to the stamp duties on newspapers and supplements thereto, to repeal the duty on advertisements, and otherwise to amend the laws relating to stamp duties," certain stamp duties specified and contained in a schedule to the said Act annexed were granted and made payable in Great Britain and Ireland for and in respect of (amongst other things) certificates to be taken out yearly by every person admitted as an attorney or solicitor in any of her Majesty's courts at Westminster, or in Ireland, or in any other court in England, holding pleas where the debt or damage amounts to forty shillings; and by every person admitted as a writer to the signet, or as a solicitor, agent, attorney, or procurator in any of the courts in Scotland; and by every person admitted or enrolled as a notary public in England, Scotland, or Ireland, who in his own name or in the name of any other person shall commence, prosecute, carry on, or defend any action, suit, prosecution, or any other proceeding, or other proceeding in any of the courts aforesaid, or do any notarial act whatever, for or in any expectation of any fee, gain, or reward, as an attorney, solicitor, agent, proctor, procurator, or notary public, although not admitted or enrolled as such:*

And whereas it is expedient that the said duties should be repealed:

Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same:

1. *Duties on annual certificates to be taken out by solicitors repealed.] That from and after the passing of this Act the duties aforesaid shall cease and be no longer paid or payable.*

2. *Every person admitted a solicitor shall take out a certificate of his admission.] Any person who shall be admitted or enrolled a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England or of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland shall, before he shall act as a solicitor, or as such solicitor shall sue out any writ or process, or commence, carry on, solicit, or defend any action, suit, or other proceeding in the name of any other person or in his own name in the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, or in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland, or in any county court, or in any court of civil or criminal jurisdiction in the United Kingdom of Great Britain or Ireland, or act as a solicitor in any cause, matter, or suit, civil or criminal, to be heard, tried, or determined in either of the Houses of Parliament, or before any justice of assize of eyre or terminer or gaol delivery, or at any general or quarter sessions of the peace for any county, riding, division, liberty, city, borough, or place, or before any justice or justices, or before any commissioners of her Majesty's revenue, obtain from the registrar of solicitors a certificate of his being duly enrolled as a solicitor.*

3. *Registrar of solicitors to keep a roll.] From and after the passing of this Act there shall be a registrar of solicitors, and it shall be the duty of such registrar to keep an alphabetical roll or book, or rolls or books, of all solicitors, and to issue to persons who have been admitted and enrolled as solicitors certificates entitling them to practise as such; and it shall and may be lawful to and for the Lord Chancellor, or any judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England, or the Lord Chancellor, or any judge of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland, to make such orders, directions, and regulations touching the performance and execution of the duties aforesaid as they shall think proper. And such registrar, or some person duly appointed by him, shall have free access to, and shall be at liberty from time to time to examine and take copies or extracts without fee or reward of, all rolls or books kept for the enrolment of solicitors in any of the divisions of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England or of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland; and that the duties of such office of registrar shall be performed as in manner provided and directed by an Act passed in the session of Parliament held in the sixth and seventh years of the reign of her present Majesty, intituled "An Act for consolidating and amending several of the laws relating to attorneys and solicitors practising in England and Wales," and in manner provided and directed by another Act passed in the session of Parliament held in the twenty-ninth and thirtieth years of the reign of her present Majesty, intituled "An Act to amend the laws for the*

regulation of the profession of attorneys and solicitors in Ireland, and to assimilate them to those in England."

4. On application for a certificate a declaration to be signed and entered in a book.] For the purpose of obtaining such registrar's certificate as aforesaid, a declaration in writing signed by such solicitor or by his partner, or in case such solicitor shall reside more than twenty miles from London, or more than twenty miles from Dublin, then by his London agent, or by his Dublin agent, on his behalf, containing his full name and place of residence, together with the term and year in or as of which he was so admitted, shall be delivered to the said registrar, who shall cause all the particulars in such declaration to be entered in a proper book to be kept for that purpose, which shall be open to the inspection and examination of all persons without fee or reward; and the said registrar shall, after the expiration of six days after the delivery of such declaration (unless he shall see cause and have reason to believe that the party applying for such certificate is not upon the said roll of solicitors), deliver to the said solicitor or his agent on demand, and upon payment of the sum of ten shillings, a certificate in the form or to the effect set forth in the schedule to the Act annexed.

5. On registrar's refusal to issue certificate application to be made to court.] And be it enacted that in case the said registrar shall decline to issue such certificate as he is herein-before directed and required to give, the party so applying for the same, if a solicitor, shall and may apply to any judge of any of the divisions of the Supreme Court of Judicature in England or in Ireland, who is hereby authorised to make such order in the matter as shall be just, and to order payment of costs by and to either of the parties if he shall see fit.

6. Repeat of such of the Provisions of 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, and 29 & 30 Vict. c. 84, relating to certificates as are inconsistent with this Act.] And whereas some of the provisions of the aforesaid Act of the sixth and seventh years of the reign of her Majesty, and of the Act of the sixteenth and seventeenth years, and of the twenty-ninth and thirtieth years of said reign, are no longer necessary, and ought to be repealed: Be it therefore enacted that such of the provisions of the said recited Acts with respect to certificates as are repugnant to or inconsistent with the provisions of this Act shall be and the same are hereby repealed.

7. Certificate under this Act equivalent to a stamped certificate.] All acts which by any law now in force are required to be done by a solicitor having obtained a stamped certificate shall be valid and effectual if done by a solicitor having obtained a certificate under this Act, and that the obtaining of a certificate under the provisions of this Act by any solicitor shall be deemed to be a compliance with the provisions of any law now in force requiring such solicitor to take out a stamped certificate.

8. Title of Act.] This Act may be cited as the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty Repeal Act, 1886.

#### SCHEDULE to which the foregoing Act refers.

##### FORM OF REGISTRAR'S CERTIFICATE.

No.

Pursuant to an Act passed in the Session or Parliament held in the and years of the reign of Queen Victoria, intituled "An Act to repeal the Solicitors' Annual Certificate Duty," I A. B., registrar of solicitors appointed under the said Act, (or I. C. D., secretary of the society of solicitors, proctors, and others, not being barristers, practising in the Courts of Law and Equity of the United Kingdom, authorized to perform the duties of the office of registrar of solicitors under the said Act,) do hereby certify, that E. F. of has this day delivered and left with me a declaration in writing, signed by the said E. F. (or by G. H., his partner, or by I. K., his London agent, on his behalf), containing his name and place of residence, and the court, or one of the courts, of which he is admitted a solicitor, together with the term and year in or as of which he was so admitted. And I do further certify, that the said E. F. is duly enrolled a solicitor in the High Court of Chancery, and is entitled to practise as a solicitor.

In witness whereof, I have this day of in the year 18 set my hand hereunto.

#### LEGAL NEWS.

The Attorney-General was on Saturday evening entertained dinner in the Inner Temple-Hall (the use of which was granted to the Benchers for the occasion) by the members of the Northern Circuit, in celebration of his recent appointment as Attorney-General. The chair was taken by Mr. Serjeant Simon, M.P., and among those present were the Lord Chancellor, the Master of the Rolls (Lord Esher), Mr. Justice Butt, and many members of the Circuit.

At the Marylebone Police Court on Tuesday, Mr. Thomas Sampson, of 252, Marylebone-road, appeared in answer to five summonses taken out by the Incorporated Law Society for practising as a solicitor without having taken out his certificate. Mr. Humphreys, solicitor, represented the society. The defendant pleaded "Guilty." Mr. De Ruzen said that this was a very grave professional offence, and none knew that better than the defendant. There would be a fine of £5 in each case, with the costs. The fines and costs amounted altogether to £30 1s., and the defendant was allowed a month in which to pay the money.

On Saturday last, the 27th of March, a dinner was given by the South-Eastern Circuit to Mr. Justice Grantham, to congratulate him on his elevation to the bench. The dinner was held at the Albion, Aldersgate-

street, Mr. Murphy, Q.C., occupied the chair, supported on his right by the guest of the evening, Mr. Justice Grantham. Among the numerous past and present members of the circuit who met to do honour to the new judge were:—the Earl of Milltown, Mr. Justice Mathew, Mr. Justice Day, Mr. Justice A. L. Smith, Mr. Serjeant Robinson, Messrs. Wm. Willis, Q.C., F. Meadows White, Q.C., Charles Hall, Q.C., M.P., J. Shire Will, Q.C., M.P., Lumley Smith, Q.C., A. M. Channell, Q.C., J. Digby, E. J. Athawes, H. Avory, E. T. Besley, Curtis Bennett, W. P. G. Boxall, H. Bradford, J. Bridge, A. M. Bremner, J. A. B. Bruce, Slade Butler, G. Candy, C. M. Chapman, A. Cock, H. A. de Colyar, J. A. Day, S. H. Day, Bargrave Deane, W. P. Eversley, H. Forman, Forrest Fulton, C. F. Gill, W. E. Gordon, F. C. Gore, J. P. Grain, W. Grubbe, M. G. Guiry, Edwyn Jones, English Harrison, L. Hart, Holland, E. S. Hope, C. E. Jennett, G. Laing, R. O. B. Lane, E. P. A. Law, Lush-Wilson, F. Merrifield, Nasmyth, North, J. Horne Payne, F. T. Piggott, Pollard, Edward Pollock, M. Powell, A. H. Poysler, H. C. Richards, P. Rose-Innes, W. Rosher, W. E. Saunders, C. C. Scott, Henderson Scott, P. Stern, Baldock Stone, Stuart, Wedderburn, Williams, E. C. Willoughby, H. A. Wix, Weightman Wood, Sidney Woolf, E. Marshall Hall (the junior of the circuit), and many others, to the number of one hundred.

At the Wolverhampton Police-court on Wednesday, says the *Birmingham Daily Post*, before the Stipendiary (Mr. N. C. A. Neville), Mr. William Bowen, solicitor and vestry clerk of Bilston, was charged on a summons issued under the 12th section of the Solicitors' Act of 1874 with acting as a solicitor without possessing a stamped certificate. Mr. A. Whitehouse prosecuted on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, and Mr. T. Dallow appeared for the defence.—Mr. Whitehouse stated that the case against Mr. Bowen was that he had acted as solicitor on the 15th January of this year at the County Court in Wolverhampton, for a man named Ray, in the action of *Ray v. Banks & Co.* A "Law List" was put in to show that Mr. Bowen's name was not therein.—Mr. Dallow asked that the case might be adjourned, since the necessary action on Mr. Bowen's part had been commenced in London, and would, he was informed, take some six weeks to complete. The certificate had been renewed, but was not stamped.—The Stipendiary decided to proceed with the case.—Mr. R. J. Lawrence, solicitor, was called to prove that defendant had committed the offence complained of.—Mr. Dallow urged that his client had merely committed a technical offence, and that unwillingly. He had proved his wish to avoid transgression by applying for reinstatement.—The case against Mr. John E. Fellows, of Bilston, was next heard. Mr. Fellows was charged with acting as a solicitor without being in possession of the requisite certificate in a case heard at the Bilston Police Court, on December 15th. Defendant now submitted that he was at that time not able to pay the cost of a certificate, but he was now taking measures to obtain it. Proof of Mr. Fellows having acted as a solicitor on the occasion mentioned was given by Mr. W. A. Green, stipendiary magistrate's clerk.—Mr. Henry Saunders, of Wolverhampton, was also charged with practising in the case of *Dowen v. Lawatt*, heard in the Police-court, Wolverhampton, on November 18th, having neglected to first take out a certificate. Mr. Saunders pleaded, in defence, that he did not receive any fee in the case, for the simple reason that he had taken out no certificate.—Mr. Neville (the stipendiary) said that these cases were of considerable importance, because of the necessity which existed that members of the legal profession, who had so deep an insight into the private affairs of their clients, should have to conform to severe restrictions. As the law reports frequently showed, in spite of the increased severity of those restrictions, many persons were admitted as solicitors who ought never to be so admitted. It was the duty of every solicitor to take out his certificate when due. Mr. Fellows had given no reason for his neglect, except a somewhat sad one—that he was short of money to pay the stamp duties. Mr. Saunders had absolutely no defence, while Mr. Bowen should have known whether or not his certificate was stamped. Each defendant would be fined £5 and costs.

#### COURT PAPERS.

##### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Date.	ROTA OF REGISTRAES IN ATTENDANCE ON		
	APPEAL COURT	APPEAL COURT	Mr. Justice KAY.
Mon. Apr. 5	Mr. King	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday ... 6	Farrer	Ward	King
Wednesday ... 7	Ward	Pemberton	Farrer
Thursday ... 8	Pemberton	Ward	King
Friday ... 9	Clowes	Pemberton	Farrer
Saturday ... 10	Koe	Ward	King
	Mr. Justice CHITTIN.	Mr. Justice NORTH.	Mr. Justice PEABSON.
Monday, Apr. ....	5 Mr. Koe	Mr. Pugh	Mr. Beal
Tuesday .....	6 Clowes	Lavie	Leach
Wednesday .....	7 Koe	Pugh	Beal
Thursday .....	8 Clowes	Lavie	Leach
Friday .....	9 Koe	Pugh	Beal
Saturday .....	10 Clowes	Lavie	Leach

FEE, TWO GUINEAS, for a sanitary inspection and report on a London dwelling-house. County surveys by arrangement. The Sanitary Engineering and Ventilation Company, 115, Victoria-street, Westminster. Prospectus free.—[ADVT.]

FURNISH ON NORMAN & STAGET'S HIRE PURCHASE SYSTEM, 1, 2, or 8 years; best method. Offices, 79, Queen Victoria-street, E.C. Branches at 131, Pall Mall, S.W., and 9, Liverpool-street, E.C.—[ADVT.]

## COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.  
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.  
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**ARMY AND NAVY HOTEL, LIMITED.**—Bacon, V.C., has fixed April 7 at 12, at his chambers, for the appointment of an official liquidator  
**BALKIS COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 24, directed to be heard before Bacon, V.C., on April 3. O'Callaghan, South sq., Gray's inn, solicitor for the petitioner  
**BRITISH ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Pearson, J., has, by an order dated March 3, appointed Henry Threlkeld Edwards, 66, Coleman st, to be official liquidator  
**NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY OF MONTE VIDEO COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Chitty, J., has, by an order dated Feb 22, appointed Frederick Whinney, 8, Old Jewry, to be liquidator in the place of Edward John Davis, deceased, and to act jointly with Fritz Bernhard Behr, the surviving liquidator

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**CRAVEN IRON COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 30, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on April 10. Warren and Co, Bloomsbury sq, solicitors for the petitioner

**CRYSTAL PORCELAIN POTTERY COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Kay, J., dated March 20, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Bompas and Co, Gt Winchester st, solicitors for the petitioner

**GENERAL ICE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard before Pearson, J., on Saturday, April 10. Abrahams and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners

**HIGHAM CREEK BRICK COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 25, directed to be heard before Kay, J., on Saturday, April 10. Shaw and Tremellen, Gray's inn sq, agents for Mitchell, Gravesend, solicitor for the petitioners

**MACHEN LEON AND TINPLATE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 26, directed to be heard before Bacon, V.C., on April 10. Warminster, Walbrook, agent for Baillhache, Newport, solicitor for the petitioner

**OLD CAERGWYLLE FORGE COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated March 20, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Chester and Co, Staple inn, solicitors for the petitioner

**OLIVER AND COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Chitty, J., dated March 20, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Chester and Co, Staple inn, agents for Black and Marshall, Chesterfield, solicitors for the petitioner

**WALKER AND HACKING, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Kay, J., dated March 20, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Shaw and Tremellen, Gray's inn sq, agents for Watson, Bury, solicitors for the petitioners

**WARREN'S PATENT EMBOSSED GLASS COMPANY, LIMITED.**—By an order made by Bacon, V.C., dated March 20, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Combe and Co, Bucklersbury, solicitors for the petitioners

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

## COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASSTER.

## LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

**HENSHAW AND LORELLI, LIMITED.**—Petition for winding up, presented March 6, directed to be heard before the Vice-Chancellor, at the Assize Courts, Strange-ways, Manchester, on April 12 at 10.30. Millar, Manchester, solicitor for the petitioners

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

## FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

**OWSLEBURY BENEFIT SOCIETY, Owslebury, Hants.** March 22  
**TETTENHALL UNION FRIENDLY SOCIETY, New Inn, Tettenhall, Stafford.** March 20

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**NORTHERN COUNTIES MUTUAL AID ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.** Stockton on Tees, Durham. March 24  
**PICARD AND WALONS BENEFIT SOCIETY, Rising Sun, Sale st, Bethnal Green.** March 24

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

## CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.  
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

**JERRED, LEWIS RIGSBY, Exeter, Wine Merchant.** April 11. Part v Jerred, Registrar, Exeter. Ford, Exeter  
**JONES, ARTHUR CURTON, Mitcham, Surrey, Brewer.** April 12. Jones v Wilks, Pearson, J. Jerome, Basinghall st  
**TUNNER, JOHN, Starbeck, near Harrogate, Gent.** April 12. Turner v Jackson, Bacon, V.C. Stubbs, John st, Bedford row

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**CARPENTER, ALFRED, Median rd, Lower Clayton, Baker.** April 16. Alexander v Carpenter, Chitty, J. Eves, Mark lane  
**WORKMAN, REV WILLIAM RING, Basingstoke, Southampton.** April 10. Workman v Workman, Kay, J. Brooks and Co, Godliman st, Doctors' commons

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**ALEXANDER, PHILIP DOUGLAS, Clifton, Bristol, Commission Merchant.** April 20  
**Mieling v Jones, Chitty, J. Chinnery and Co, Brabant et, Grosvenor st**  
**BURN, SARAH, Asylums rd, Old Kent rd.** April 28. Bailey v Cattell, Pearson, J. Wilson, Bedford row

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**JARRATT, GEOERGE JARRATT, Unsworth, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer.** April 10. Bury Banking Co Limited v Crompton, Registrar, Manchester. Shippey, Manchester

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

**ROOD, GEORGE FREDERICK, Ramsgate, Kent, Gent.** April 10. Hermitage v Christian, Bacon, V.C. Hills, Margate

[*Gazette*, March 26.]CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP 36.  
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

**ARNOULD, JOSEPH, Florence, Italy, Knight.** April 10. Murray and Co, Birch Lane  
**ASHTON, RICHARD PALMER, Brook st, Grosvenor sq, Stockbroker.** April 30. Robins, Panora Lane  
**BARRATT, WILLIAM, New st, Covent Garden, Licensed Victualler.** April 30. Lee, New Inn, Strand  
**BARNES, GEORGE, Reading, Berks, Builder.** May 1. Beale and Martin, Reading  
**BOWKEE, THOMAS POWELL, Balford, Lancaster, Grocer.** April 24. Dixon, Manchester  
**BUNSON, ISAAC, Manchester, Tea Merchant.** April 27. Dixon, Manchester

- CHERRY, WILLIAM FREDERICK, Liverpool, Commercial Traveller.** April 20. Cherry, Great James st, Bedford row  
**DAVIS, DAVID, Aberdare, Glamorgan, Esq.** April 20. Babington Jones, Cardiff  
**DRAKE, MARY USQUILA, Witham, Essex.** May 15. Stevens and Co, Witham  
**EYRE, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Avenue des Champs, Elysee, Paris, Esq.** June 1. Bircham and Co, Parliament st, Westminster  
**GARTHORPE, RALPH THOMAS, Brixton Oval, Surrey, Esq.** April 20. Hinckley and Co, College hill  
**GRIMES, ANN MARIA, Leamington Priors, Warwick.** April 17. Freshfields and Williams, Bank bds  
**HANSON, JOSEPH, Oak villas, Lower Norwood, Gent.** April 16. Blake and Co, College hill, Cannon st  
**HOWELL, THOMAS, Kennington Cross, Linen Draper.** April 20. Vincent, Budge row, Camberwell  
**HUGHES, SAMUEL, Warlock rd, St Peter's pk.** April 11. Bridger, Grove lane, Denmark hill  
**LIMPRECHE, ANN WHITE, Preston, Brighton.** May 1. Sowton, Bedford row  
**MARTIN, ALEXANDER, Brownlow Fold, Bolton.** April 30. Taylor, Bolton  
**MASERS, WILLIAM, Old Sodbury, Gloucester, Yeoman.** May 1. Fussell and Co, Bristol  
**PRICE, WILLIAM, Enfield Wash, Gent.** April 20. Smith and Son, Furnival's Inn  
**PRESTLEY, JOHN, Church Stile, Rochdale, Gent.** April 30. Hartley and Co, Rochdale  
**REDFERN, Rev WILLIAM THOMAS, Taunton, Somerset, Clerk.** April 24. Channing, Taunton  
**RIDLEY, JOHN BAILY, Croydon, Surrey, Retired Cabinet Maker.** April 10. Benson, Clement's Inn, Strand  
**ROBERTS, JOHN, St Anne's on the Sea, Lancaster, Chemist.** April 21. Hankinson and Son, Manchester  
**ROSELLI, ALFRED, Cantlawes rd, Camden Town, Merchant.** April 30. Baddeley, Leadenhall st  
**ROWLANDS, JOHN, Cardiff, Shipowner.** Mar 31. Morgan, Cardiff  
**SALMON, WILLIAM, Fairford, Gloucester, Dealer.** April 30. Hitchman Esq, Fairford  
**SCULL, ANN, Bristol.** May 1. Fussell and Co, Bristol  
**SHEATHES, WILLIAM, Devonshire st, Portland pl, Livery Stable Keeper.** April 30. Indermuir and Co, Devonshire ter, Portland pl  
**SHUTE, RICHARD GROUSE, Cambridge st, Pimlico, Estate Agent.** April 27. Mackeson and Co, Lincoln's inn fields  
**SMITH, JOHN NEVE, Camden sq, Gent.** April 24. Hird, Gt Tichfield st  
**THOMASON, RICHARD, Birmingham, Surgeon.** April 14. Wood and Sons, Birmingham  
**WAKEFIELD, RICHARD, Bristol, Builder.** May 1. Fussell and Co, Bristol  
**WARING, SAMUEL, Manchester, Painter.** May 4. Tucker, Manchester  
**WOODWARD, ELEANOR, Ryde, Isle of Wight.** April 17. Proctor Street, Lincoln's Inn fields

[*Gazette*, March 26.]

## SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

- April 6.—**Messrs. CHARLES & TUBB,** at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Leasehold Property (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).  
 April 7.—**Messrs. BEAD, PRITCHARD, & WILTSHIRE,** at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Ground Rent (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).  
 April 7.—**Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOURNEFIELD,** at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Policy of Assurance (see advertisement, March 27, p. 4).  
 April 9.—**Messrs. BAKER & SONS,** at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 4).

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

- BIRTHS.**  
**DOLBEY,**—March 21, at Strefford House, Sutton, the wife of Thomas Hamer Dolbey, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.  
**FOX,**—March 27, at 2, Elsham-road, Kensington, the wife of John Charles Fox, solicitor, of a daughter.  
**JOHNSON,**—March 27, at 92, Lansdowne-road, W., the wife of Harry Johnson, of Lincoln's Inn, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.  
**JONES,**—March 30, at Kenwood, Avenue-road, Herne Bay, the wife of Henry C. Jones, solicitor, of a son.  
**LOWTHORPE-GREEN,**—March 24, at Spridlington, near Lincoln, the wife of J. W. Lowthorpe-Green, of the Middle Temple, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.  
**MEATES,**—March 25, at Lingfield-road, Wimbledon-common, the wife of T. A. Meates, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.  
**PALMER,**—March 25-26, at West Hartlepool, the wife of C. J. Palmer, solicitor, of twin sons.

## MARRIAGE.

- WARD-WALKER,**—March 30, at St Chad's, Headingley, Edmund Ward, solicitor, Leeds, to Mary Grace, only child of the late William Walker, of Carthorpe, Leyburn.

## DEATH.

- MASEFIELD,**—March 23, at The Priory, Ledbury, George Masefield, solicitor, aged 74.

## LONDON GAZETTES.

- THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.**  
 FRIDAY, March 23, 1886.  
 RECEIVING ORDERS.
- Alling and Co, Ludgate circus, Forwarding Agents, High Court. Pet Feb 22.  
 Ord Mar 23. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's Inn fields  
 Ashton, George, Bridge rd, West, Battersea, Corn Dealer. Wandsworth. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 20. Exam Apr 20  
 Batchelor, William, Allesley rd, Forest Hill, Brickmaker. Greenwich. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 20 at 1  
 Bedward, John, Kingswinford, Staffordshire, Grocer. Stourbridge. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 19. Exam Apr 18 at 11  
 Bell, William, Catchgate, nr Lintz Green, Durham, Farmer. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 6  
 Berry, Enoch, Rookin st, Shepherd's Bush, Builder. High Court. Pet Mar 22.  
 Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 21 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's Inn fields  
 Brain, Samuel, Mansfield, Gloucestershire, Plumber. Bristol. Pet Mar 28. Ord Mar 28. Exam Apr 16 at 12 at Guildhall, Bristol  
 Brooksbank, George Stamp, Ecclesfield, Yorks, Ruler. Sheffield. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 11.30  
 Broome, Timothy, Fulham, Market Gardener. High Court. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 21 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's Inn fields  
 Browne, M. A., Westminster rd, Baywater, Dressmaker. High Court. Pet Mar 2. Ord Mar 23. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's Inn fields

Bunting, James, Walsall, House Decorator. Walsall. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 14 at 12  
 Chambers, Alfred, Exeter, Poulterer. Exeter. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 15 at 11  
 Clarke, George, Adstock, Buckinghamshire, Innkeeper. Banbury. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 13  
 Creaser, James, York, Joiner. York. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 30  
 Dawson, Henry Richard Cobden, Liverpool, Solicitor. Liverpool. Pet Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool  
 Drake, William, Isle of Ely, Cambridgeshire, Builder. Cambridge. Pet Mar 10. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 21 at 2  
 Ernest, Jules, Gutter lane, Manufacturers' Agent. High Court. Pet Mar 17. Ord Mar 22. Exam May 14 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Fairhurst, Joseph, Liverpool, Restaurateur. Liverpool. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 5 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool pool  
 Fletcher, John, Redditch, Worcestershire, out of business. Birmingham. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 21 at 2  
 Fowler, Frederick, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Wire Worker. Birmingham. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 21 at 2  
 Fryer, Benjamin, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Painter. Wolverhampton. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 19  
 Hide, George Duke, jun, Angmering, Sussex, Farmer. Brighton. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 8 at 11  
 Hogg, John, High st, Marylebone, Public house Manager. High Court. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam May 14 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Holdsworth, Samuel, Leeds, Builder. Leeds. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 13 at 11  
 Hollingdale, Henry, Hadlow, Kent, Farmer. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam May 13 at 2  
 Horton, John, Ferndale, Glamorganshire, Fishmonger. Pontypridd. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 13 at 2  
 Hudson, Samuel, Peakirk, Northamptonshire, Railway Servant. Peterborough. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 5 at 1  
 Hunt, Robert, Charles st, St James's, Gentleman. High Court. Pet Oct 27. Ord Mar 24. Exam May 14 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Jarratt, James, Yarwell, Northamptonshire, Gentleman. Peterborough. Pet Mar 16. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 14 at 12  
 Johnson, Edward, Welton, Yorks, Saddler. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 2 at Court house, Townhall, Hull  
 Jones, William, Cwmbran, Mon., Licensed Victualler. Newport, Mon. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 11  
 Jordan, Thomas, Caldewgate, Carlisle, Butcher. Carlisle. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 6 at 11 at Court house, Carlisle  
 King, Arthur Charles, Winchester, Hair Dresser. Winchester. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 14 at 10  
 Lloyd, Thomas, Wellington, Herefordshire, Innkeeper. Hereford. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 9  
 Mason, Edward Buckman, Alford, Lincolnshire, Tinplate Worker. Boston. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 20. Exam Apr 8 at 2  
 May, George Henry, Sheffield, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 29 at 11.30  
 Meyer, Montague, and Ernest Morris, Aldersgate st, Wholesale Furriers. High Court. Pet Jan 29. Ord Feb 26. Exam Apr 8  
 Morris, Walter, Weymouth, Dorset, Gentleman. Dorchester. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 8 at 12.30 at County Hall, Dorchester  
 Murley, Thomas William, Buckingham Palace rd, Provision Merchant, High Court. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam May 6 at 12.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Nodder, Richard Joseph, Liverpool, Accountant. Liverpool. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 1 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool  
 Orrama, Frederick Wattis, Leeds, Hay Dealer. Leeds. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 13 at 11  
 Perry, Charles Frederick, Birmingham, Artist's Colourman. Birmingham. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 21 at 11  
 Pinfold, Austin, Birmingham, Baker. Birmingham. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 7 at 2  
 Piper, Edward, Winchester, Fishmonger. Winchester. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 14 at 10  
 Preston, William Henry, Walton, nr Liverpool, Timber Broker. Liverpool. Pet Mar 9. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool  
 Prudmore, Joseph, Eaton Socon, Bedfordshire, Grocer. Bedford. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 22. Exam May 5  
 Richardson, Hannah Lee, Batley, Yorks, Woollen Manufacturer. Dewsbury. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 12  
 Robson, Thomas, Royton, Lancs, late Innkeeper. Oldham. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 20 at 11.30  
 Saul, Richard, Birkenhead, Tailor. Birkenhead. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Mar 31  
 Sawyer, Harry, Lamberhurst, Kent, Grocer. Tonbridge Wells. Pet Mar 1. Ord Mar 23. Exam May 13 at 2  
 Shakespeare, William Carey, Nethersal, Leicestershire, Farmer. Burton on Trent. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 15 at 1  
 Shepherd, Heaton, Huddersfield, Butcher. Huddersfield. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 10 at 11  
 Sillery, Robert Seymour Croxton, Tiverton, Devon, no occupation. Exeter. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 15 at 11  
 Skirrow, George Eustace, Regent st, Publisher. High Court. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 22. Exam May 4 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Smart, William, Petersfield, Hampshire, Cabinet Maker. Portsmouth. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 12  
 Stone, Richard, sen, Marcham, Berks, Farmer. Oxford. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 8 at 11.30  
 Stoner, John, Kingston upon Hull, Innkeeper. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 19 at 2 at Court house, Townhall, Hull  
 Stones, Edwin, Woodville, Leicestershire, Grocer. Burton on Trent. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 15 at 1  
 Taylor, Thomas, Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, Wheelwright. Burton on Trent. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 15 at 1  
 Taylor, Walter Arthur, Brigg, Lincolnshire, Clerk in Holy Orders. Gt. Grimsby. Pet Mar 4. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 14 at 11 at Townhall, Grimsby  
 Thomas, Job, Newport, Mon., Marble Worker. Newport, Mon. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam Apr 5 at 11  
 Veriod, James George, Salisbury, Grocer. Salisbury. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam May 7 at 12  
 Watts, William, Cardiff, Boot Maker. Cardiff. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22. Exam Apr 15 at 2  
 Williams, Martha, Owsnavon, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Neath. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 6 at 11 at Townhall, Neath  
 Woodham, Henry, Hungerford, Berks, Watchmaker. Newbury. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23. Exam May 12 at 2

**RECEIVING ORDER RECEIVED.**

Harris, Alben Booth, Bournemouth, Lodging House Keeper. Ord Dec 7. Poole. Recd. Mar 21

**FIRST MEETINGS.**

Abbott, John, Ambleside, Westmorland, Saddler. Apr 2 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 2, Paxton ter, Barrow in Furness

Alkin, Richard, Hartshill, nr Atherton, Warwickshire, Gent. Apr 6 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham  
 Beadell, Thomas, Cranleigh, Furniture Dealer. Apr 6 at 11.30. Borough and County Hall, Guildford, Surrey  
 Bell, William, Catchgate, nr Lintz Green, Durham, Farmer. Apr 6 at 2. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne  
 Boreham, Charles, Kelvedon Common, Essex, Carpenter. Apr 3 at 11. County Court, Brentwood  
 Brain, Samuel George, Mangotsfield, Gloucestershire, Plumber. Apr 6 at 10.30. Official Receiver, Bank chmrs, Bristol  
 Burdell, William Chatterton, Nottingham, out of business. Apr 2 at 12. Official Receiver, 1, High pavement, Nottingham  
 Chambers, Alfred, Exeter, Poulterer. Apr 5 at 10. Castle of Exeter, at Exeter  
 Creaser, James, York, Joiner. Apr 7 at 12. Official Receiver, 17, Blake st, York  
 Danby, Sarah, Taunton, Tobacconist. Apr 2 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 9, Middle st, Taunton  
 Elliott, John, Whitecross st, Fruiterer. Apr 12 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Fryer, Benjamin, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Painter. Apr 5 at 4. Official Receiver, St Peter's close, Wolverhampton  
 Gibbatsen, Henry John, Oldham, Lancashire, Saddler. Apr 2 at 3. Official Receiver, Priory chmrs, Union st, Oldham  
 Girling, Richard, Roydon, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 3 at 12.45. Magistrates' Room, Diss  
 Green, George, Ash, nr Sandwich, Builder. Apr 2 at 2. 32, St George's st, Canterbury  
 Green, George, Oldbury, Baker. Apr 5 at 10.30. Court house, Oldbury  
 Hamond, Stephen George, Dover, Builder. Apr 2 at 10.15. 32, St George's st, Canterbury  
 Hargreaves, Edward, Dovercourt, Essex, Schoolmaster. Apr 2 at 4. Townhall, Colchester  
 Hide, George Duke, jun, Angmering, Sussex, Farmer. Apr 3 at 2. Norfolk Hotel, Arundel  
 Hitchcock, John, Horley, Oxfordshire, Farmer. Apr 6 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 1, St Aldates, Oxford  
 Holyoke, William, Marylebone rd, Artist. Apr 15 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Horsfield, Osmond, Ashton under Lyne, Lancashire, Tailor. Apr 2 at 2. Official Receiver, Townhall chmrs, Ashton under Lyne  
 Hudson, Samuel, Peakirk, Northamptonshire, Railway Servant. Apr 5 at 12.45. County Court, Peterborough  
 Hunt, William James, New Inn yard, Shoreditch, Box Manufacturer. Apr 14 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Jacques, Tom, Nelson st, Barnsley, Joiner. Apr 5 at 11.30. Official Receiver, 3, Eastgate, Barnsley  
 Jenkins, Sophia, Aberystwith, Cardiganshire, Milliner. Apr 3 at 11. Lion Hotel, Aberystwith  
 Johnson, Edward, Welton, Yorks, Saddler. Apr 6 at 11. Hull Incorporated Law Society, Lincoln's inn bldgs, Bowalley lane, Hull  
 Jones, William, Cwmbran, Mon., Licensed Victualler. Apr 6 at 1. Official Receiver, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon.  
 Jordan, Thomas Caldewgate, Carlisle, Butcher. Apr 6 at 12. Official Receiver, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle  
 King, Arthur Charles, Winchester, Hairdresser. Apr 5 at 3. Official Receiver, 74, High st, Winchester  
 Lambert, George, and Edwin Lambert, Horsmonden, Kent, Millers. Apr 2 at 2 Spencer & Reeves, Grove rd, Tonbridge Wells  
 Larnder, Robert William, and John Barton, Harp lane, Lightermen. Apr 5 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Lawrence, Edward, Epping, Essex, Hotel Keeper. Apr 7 at 12. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane  
 Long, James Alfred, Canterbury, Fishmonger. Apr 2 at 9.45. 32, St George's st, Canterbury  
 Muscott, Edmund, and Frederick Bruce Muscott, Fenchurch st, Shoe Manufacturers. Apr 7 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Osborne, Isaac, Norfolk, Builder. Apr 3 at 2. The Magistrates' Room, Diss  
 Parfitt, William, North rd, Caledonian rd, Timber Dealer. Apr 5 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Patten, Frederick Henry Moyse, Stratford St Mary, Suffolk, Horse Dealer. Apr 2 at 11. Townhall, Colchester  
 Piper, Edward, Winchester, Fishmonger. Apr 6 at 3. Official Receiver, 74, High st, Winchester  
 Plenty, Edwin George, Beaumont st, Mile End rd, Cowkeeper. Apr 7 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields  
 Pye, James George, Carnforth, Lancashire, Bill Poster. Apr 2 at 1.30. Station Hotel, Carnforth  
 Richards, David Phillips, Aberystwith, Cardiganshire, Grocer. Apr 2 at 11. Raven Hotel, Shrewsbury  
 Robson, Thomas, Royton, Lancashire, Late Innkeeper. Apr 5 at 3. Official Receiver, Priory chmrs, Union st, Oldham  
 Rogers, George, Sheffield, Foreman. Apr 6 at 12. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield  
 Shepherd, Heaton, Bradford, Yorks, Butcher. Apr 5 at 3. Official Receiver, Albert bldgs, New st, Huddersfield, Yorks  
 Shepherd, Thomas, Nottingham, Coal Merchant's Clerk. Apr 2 at 2. Official Receiver, 1, High pavement, Nottingham  
 Sillery, Robert Seymour Croxton, Tiverton, Devon, no occupation. Apr 5 at 4. Palmerston Hotel, Tiverton  
 Sperring, Henry, Banwell, Somerset, Farmer. Apr 3 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Bank chmrs, Bristol  
 Stoner, John, Kingston upon Hull, Innkeeper. Apr 5 at 3. Incorporated Law Society, Lincoln's inn bldgs, Bowalley lane, Hull  
 Strong, George, Tottenham, Timber Merchant. Apr 5 at 11. 28 and 29, St Swithin's lane  
 Tagg, James, Oxford, Dairyman. Apr 3 at 11. Official Receiver, 1, St Aldates, Oxford  
 Thomas, Job, Newport, Mon., Marble Worker. Apr 6 at 3. Official Receiver, 12, Tredegar pl, Newport, Mon.  
 Twelves, Charles Gilbert, Sheffield, Painter. Apr 6 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Figtree lane, Sheffield  
 Veriod, James George, Salisbury, Grocer. Apr 5 at 3.30. Official Receiver, Salisbury  
 Whybom, John William, Shoreham, Grocer. Apr 5 at 12. Official Receiver, 39, Bond st, Brighton  
 Williams, Martha, Owsnavon, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Apr 5 at 11. Official Receiver, 6, Rutland st, Swansea

**ADJUDICATIONS.**

Alwen, Noah James, Dowdeswell, Gloucestershire, Farmer. Cheltenham. Pet Mar 18. Or 1 Mar 19  
 Boddiard, John, Kingswinford, Staffordshire, Grocer. Stourbridge. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 19  
 Boston, Alfred Bate, Richmond, no occupation. Wandsworth. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 20  
 Brookbank, George Stamp, Ecclesfield, Yorks, Roller. Sheffield. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23  
 Brown, Solomon, Great Yarmouth, Smackmaster. Great Yarmouth. Pet Feb 10. Ord Mar 24

April 3, 1886.

## THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

377

- Burdell, William Chatterton, Nottingham, out of business. Nottingham. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 22.
- Calvert, Thomas, Grafton, Publican. York. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 23.
- Carter, John, Preston, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. Preston. Pet Mar 6. Ord Mar 20.
- Cox, Arthur, Gorleston, Suffolk, Publican, Great Yarmouth. Pet Mar 3. Ord Mar 24.
- Cursley, Arthur Woodcock, Leicester, Builder. Leicester. Pet Mar 1. Ord Mar 22.
- Danby, Sarah, Taunton, Tobacconist. Taunton. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 22.
- Dewick, Joseph, Leicester, Hairdresser. Leicester. Pet Mar 1. Ord Mar 22.
- Drake, John, Sheffield, Printer's Manager. Sheffield. Pet Mar 2. Ord Mar 23.
- Drummond, John, George yard, Fenchurch st, Drug Merchant. High Court. Pet Jan 19. Ord Mar 24.
- Ernest, Jules, Gutter lane, Manufacturers' Agent. High Court. Pet Mar 17. Ord Mar 24.
- Fryer, Benjamin, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Painter. Wolverhampton. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 24.
- Garrow, Alfred, South Croxton, Leicestershire, Labourer. Leicester. Pet Mar 3. Ord Mar 22.
- Hansom, Henry John, Park rd, Haverstock hill, Architect. High Court. Pet Jan 27. Ord Mar 23.
- Harris, George Edward, Slough, Railway Clerk. Windsor. Pet Mar 2. Ord Mar 20.
- Hart, Francis John, Staindrop, Durham, Innkeeper. Stockton on Tees and Middlesborough. Pet Mar 4. Ord Mar 23.
- Hoggett, William Edward, Newcastle on Tyne, Commission Agent. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 17. Ord Mar 23.
- Holdsworth, Samuel, Leeds, Builder. Leeds. Pet Mar 21. Ord Mar 23.
- Hooton, Charles, Walsoken, Norfolk, Flahmonger. King's Lynn. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 22.
- Johnson, Arthur, Leek, Staffordshire, Silk Broker. Macclesfield. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 23.
- Jordan, Thomas, Caldewgate, Carlisle, Butcher. Carlisle. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23.
- Lewis, Frederick William, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Hotel Keeper. Newport and Ryde. Pet Dec 21. Ord Mar 23.
- Lloyd, Thomas, Wellington, Herefordshire, Innkeeper. Hereford. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24.
- Mason, Edward Buckman, Alford, Lincolnshire, Tinplate Worker. Boston. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 20.
- May, George Henry, Sheffield, Grocer. Sheffield. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24.
- Middleton, Joseph, Smethwick, Staffordshire, Merchant's Clerk. Birmingham. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 23.
- Molteni, Alexander, Newcastle on Tyne, Cabinet Maker. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Feb 6. Ord Mar 23.
- Morrison, Thomas, Newcastle on Tyne, Machinist. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 9. Ord Mar 24.
- Nicholson, Joseph Alfred, jun., Swansea, Importer of Iron Ore. High Court. Pet Feb 4. Ord Mar 23.
- Nodder, Richard Joseph, Wavertree, near Liverpool, Accountant, Liverpool. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 24.
- Norris, Frederick George, Great Yarmouth, Boot Manufacturer. Great Yarmouth. Pet Feb 20. Ord Mar 24.
- Oades, Charles, and William Oades, Egham, Surrey, Builders. Kingston, Surrey. Pet Jan 29. Ord Mar 24.
- Ogden, Sarah, Heywood, Lancashire, Dealer in Clothes. Oldham. Pet Mar 5. Ord Mar 21.
- Orams, Frederick Watts, Leeds, Hay Dealer. Leeds. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 23.
- Pinfold, Austin, Birmingham, Baker. Birmingham. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 23.
- Roebrook, James, Barrow, Suffolk, Innkeeper. Bury St Edmunds. Pet Mar 17. Ord Mar 20.
- Saul, Richard, Birkenhead, Tailor. Birkenhead. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 23.
- Schriger, Major, Dover st, Flockeally. High Court. Pet Feb 19. Ord Mar 23.
- Slingby, Thomas, King's Cliffe, Northamptonshire, Carpenter. Peterborough. Pet Mar 15. Ord Mar 24.
- Smart, William, Petersfield, Hants, Cabinet Maker. Portsmouth. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 24.
- Sperring, Henry, Banwell, Somerset, Farmer. Wells. Pet Mar 13. Ord Mar 24.
- Spiegelhalter, Lorenz, and Hermann Spiegelhalter, Whitechapel rd, Watch Makers. High Court. Pet Feb 23. Ord Mar 23.
- Stoner, John, Kingston upon Hull, Innkeeper. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 24.
- Strong, George, Tottenham, Timber Merchant. Edmonton. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 24.
- Taylor, Benjamin, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fish Merchant. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Mar 13. Ord Mar 24.
- Thomas, David, Trawsfynydd, Merionethshire, Farmer. Bangor. Pet Mar 13. Ord Mar 24.
- Timson, Joseph, Leicester, Confectioner. Leicester. Pet Mar 1. Ord Mar 24.
- Tooth, W. H., Brook st, Newington Butts. High Court. Pet Oct 10. Ord Mar 22.
- Wakelam, William, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Lock Manufacturer. Wolverhampton. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 22.
- Watts, William, Cardiff, Boot Maker. Cardiff. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 22.
- Watts, Walter James, Thames st, Rotherhithe, Boat Builder. High Court. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 22.
- Wells, Arthur Frederick Henry, Lewisham, Beer Retailer. Greenwich. Pet Feb 26. Ord Mar 19.
- White, Ebenezer Lilly, Birmingham, Black Ornament Manufacturer. Birmingham. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 22.
- Williams, Israel, Gellygaer, Glamorganshire, Grocer. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 22.
- TUESDAY, Mar 30, 1886.**
- RECEIVING ORDERS.**
- Airey, John, Preston, Lancashire, Insurance Agent. Preston. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 27. Exam Apr 16.
- Barker, George, Brettle lane, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler's Manager. Steurbridge. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 13 at 11.
- Bates, Henry, Duke st, St. James's, Tailor. High Court. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Beynon, James Henry, Swansea, General Dealer. Swansea. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 31.
- Bilborough, George, Hackney rd, Ironmonger. High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Charig, David, Brushfield st, Wooler, Warehouseman. High Court. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam May 12 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Clark, Bartholomew John, and Henry Vincent Prinsis Clark, Bear lane, Southwark, Engineers. High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 5 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Clarke, Arthur George, Newcastle on Tyne, Pork Butcher. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 8.
- Cole, George Stevens, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Grocer. Carmarthen. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 27. Exam Apr 8.
- Collier, William Walter, Charterhouse st, Coffee House Keeper. High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 5 at 12 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Crankshaw, Moses, Accrington, Lancashire, Labourer at Print Works. Blackburn. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 13 at 11.30.
- Curry, Robinson, and John Thomas Curry, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchants. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 8.
- Davies, John, Llandysul, Cardiganshire, Tailor. Carmarthen. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 6.
- Dillamore, James Thomas, Bedford, Commission Agent. Bedford. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 5.
- Dixon, John, Skelton, Seed Merchant. Stockton on Tees and Middlesborough. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 10 at 10.30.
- Fletcher, William, Pateley Bridge, Yorkshire, Chemist. Northallerton. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 9 at 11.30 at Court House, Northallerton.
- Forwood, Charles Brittain, Liverpool, Ship Broker. Liverpool. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 8 at 11 at Court House, Government buildings, Victoria st, Liverpool.
- Gard, George, Crawley, Sussex, Shopkeeper. Brighton. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 22 at 11.
- Goble, Frederick, Ferrers rd, Streatham, Grocer's Assistant. Wandsworth. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 29.
- Hall, Joseph, Nottingham, Agent. Nottingham. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 13.
- Harrison, Thomas, Careby, nr Stamford, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Peterborough. Pet Mar 27. Ord Mar 27. Exam Apr 14 at 12.30.
- Koe, Frederick Pemberton, and Charles Ithell Bethell, King William st, Tar Distillers. High Court. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam May 13 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Leech, Samuel Holloway, Bilston, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler. Wolverhampton. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 20.
- Liptrot, James, Nottingham, Glass Cutter. Nottingham. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 13.
- Lloyd, Joseph, Audle, Frederick Outler, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Grocer. Wolverhampton. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 25. April 19.
- Longland, Charles Arthur, and Alfred Tomlins, High st, Wandsworth, Builders. Wandsworth. Pet Feb 5. Ord Mar 11. Exam Apr 29.
- Mariott, Fred, Birstal, Yorks, Woollen Manufacturer. Dewsbury. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 12.
- Mills, Robert, Wye, Kent, Coffee House Keeper. Canterbury. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 9.
- Moore, Daniel, Jun, Walsall, Builder. Walsall. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 14 at 12.
- Moore, Francis Joseph, Ashby rd, Essex rd, Islington, out of employment. High Court. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam May 13 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Morris, Moss, Stratford, Essex, Furniture Dealer. High Court. Pet Mar 2. Ord Mar 26. Exam May 13 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Mowbray, Richard Butler, Audlem, Cheshire, out of business. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 14 at 11.30 at Crewe.
- Mumford, William, Upper Bathstone pl, Oxford st, Provision Dealer. High Court. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam May 13 at 11.30 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Nuttall, Robert, Accrington, Lancashire, Packer at Print Works. Blackburn. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 13 at 11.30.
- Parsons, Joseph, Winterslow, Wilts, Farmer. Salisbury. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam May 7 at 19.
- Peachey, Exrx, Birkenhead, Manager to a Provision Dealer. Birkenhead. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 14.
- Richards, Thomas, Dowles, nr Merthyr Tydfil, Bootmaker. Merthyr Tydfil. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 14.
- Rowe, George, Hanley, Bootmaker. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 30 at 11 at Townhall, Hanley.
- Slater, Joseph, Newcastle under Lyme, Beerhouse Keeper. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24. Exam Apr 30 at 11 at Townhall, Hanley.
- Smith, Samuel Kerrison, Bradwell, Suffolk, Farmer. Gt Yarmouth. Pet Mar 15. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 19 at 2.30 at Townhall, Gt Yarmouth.
- Steedle, Jonathan, Kirklington, Cumberland, Shoemaker. Carlisle. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Pet Apr 8 at 11 at Court house, Carlisle.
- Stennett, Alfred, Brighton, Builder. Brighton. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 22 at 11.
- Strudwick, Thomas Edward, Canterbury, Baker. Canterbury. Pet Mar 5. Ord Mar 27. Exam Apr 9.
- Twiss, William, Southport, Lancs, Auctioneer. Liverpool. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 8 at 11 at Court house, Government bldgs, Victoria st, Liverpool.
- Thorne, William Richard, Penarth, Glamorganshire, Builder. Cardiff. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 15 at 2.
- Vickers, Sarah, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Nottingham. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 26. Exam Apr 13.
- Waters, Arthur Bartholomew, Brighton, Grocer. Brighton. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 29 at 11.
- Whitney, Elizabeth, Kendal, grange sq, Lodginghouse Keeper. High Court. Pet Mar 27. Ord Mar 27. Exam May 11 at 11 at 34, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Williams, William, Bristol, Mineral Water Maker. Bristol. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25. Exam Apr 16 at 12 at Grillhall, Bristol.
- The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Mar 23.
- Thomas, Thomas Lewis, Morriston, Glamorganshire, Boot Dealer. Swansea. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 18. Exam Apr 21.
- FIRST MEETINGS.**
- Beddard, John, Kingswinford, Staffordshire, Grocer. Apr 13 at 10.30. C. Herbert Collis, Stourbridge.
- Beynon, James Henry, Swansea, General Dealer. Apr 9 at 11. Official Receiver, 6, Rutland st, Swansea.
- Bird, William Barber, Biggleswade, Bedfordshire, Grocer. Apr 8 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn.
- Bosley, James, Hurley, Berkshire, Brickmaker. Apr 8 at 12. Queen's Hotel, Reading.
- Bunting, James, Walsall, House Decorator. Apr 7 at 11. Official Receiver, Bridge st, Walsall.
- Clarke, Arthur George, Newcastle on Tyne, Pork Butcher. Apr 8 at 2.30. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.
- Clark, James Mines, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Grocer's Assistant. Apr 10 at 11. Official Receiver, 8, King st, Norwich.
- Cole, George Stevens, Llanelli, Carmarthenshire, Grocer. Apr 6 at 3. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen.
- Curd, Charles Albert, Richmond Hill, Watchmaker. Apr 6 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster.
- Curry, Robinson, and John Thomas Curry, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchants. Apr 8 at 3. Official Receiver, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.
- Dack, Robert, Wood Norton, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 10 at 1. Official Receiver, 8, King st, Norwich.
- Davies, John, Llandysul, Cardiganshire, Tailor. Apr 6 at 2.30. Official Receiver, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen.
- Drake, William, Isle of Ely, Cambridge, Builder. Apr 13 at 2.30. Lamb Hotel, Ely.
- Fairhurst, Joseph, Liverpool, Restaurateur. Apr 7 at 3. Official Receiver, 25, Victoria st, Liverpool.
- Gardiner, William, Aldgate, Master's Agent. Apr 14 at 12. 32, Carey st, Lincoln's inn fields.
- Goldsmit, Michael Joseph, Clerkenwell rd, Jeweller. Apr 9 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's inn fields.

- Hall, Joseph, Hoxton Green, Nottingham, Agent. Apr 6 at 12. Official Receiver, 1, High Pavement, Nottingham.  
 Helmore, Thomas Edmund, Leytonstone, Essex, Corn Merchant. Apr 18 at 12. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 Heyden, L. Vander, St. Mary Axe, Clerk. Apr 16 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 Heyes, William Henry, Westgate, Dewsbury, Innkeeper. Apr 6 at 10. Official Receiver, Batley.  
 Hollingdale, Henry, Hadlow, Kent, Farmer. Apr 6 at 2.30. Spender and Reeve, Mount Pleasant, Tunbridge Wells.  
 Horton, John, Ferndale, Glamorganshire, Fishmonger. Apr 6 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil.  
 Howes, William, Wymondham, Norfolk, Farmer. Apr 10 at 12. Official Receiver, 8, King st, Norwich.  
 Jarrett, James, Yarwell, Northamptonshire, Gentleman. Apr 14 at 11.45. County Court, Peterborough.  
 Kipling, John, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Grocer. Apr 7 at 2. Official Receiver, Pink Lane, Newcastle on Tyne.  
 Leech, Samuel Holloway, Bliston, Staffordshire, Licensed Victualler. Apr 9 at 11. Official Receiver, St. Peter's Close, Wolverhampton.  
 Lewis, John Davies, Penarth or Cardiff, Steel Plate Manufacturer. Apr 8 at 12. Official Receiver, 3, Crookherberton, Cardiff.  
 Lloyd, Joseph Audie Frederick Cutler, Willenhall, Staffordshire, Grocer. Apr 8 at 3. Official Receiver, St. Peter's Close, Wolverhampton.  
 Lloyd, Thomas, Wellington, Herefordshire, Innkeeper. Apr 7 at 10.30. Official Receiver, 2, Offs st, Hereford.  
 Lovelock, Mary Jane, Snelsmore, Berks, Widow. Apr 7 at 12.30. Jack Hotel, Newbury.  
 Mason, Edward Buckman, Alford, Lincolnshire, Tin Plate Worker. Apr 8 at 12.30. Official Receiver, 48, High st, Boston.  
 May, George Henry, Sheffield, Grocer. Apr 7 at 11.30. Official Receiver, Fiftree Lane, Sheffield.  
 McLeod, Mary, Liverpool, Spinster. Apr 8 at 8. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.  
 Mills, Robert, Wye, Kent, Coffee house Keeper. Apr 6 at 8. Official Receiver, 11, Bank st, Ashford.  
 Moore, Daniel, jun., Walsall, Staffordshire, Builder. Apr 7 at 2. Official Receiver, Bridge st, Walsall.  
 Morris, Walter, Weymouth, Gentleman. Apr 6 at 12.30. Royal Hotel, Weymouth.  
 Mowbray, Richard Butler, Audlem, Cheshire, out of business. Apr 14 at 10.45. Royal Hotel, Crewe.  
 Nodder, Richard, Joseph Wavertree, nr Liverpool, Accountant. Apr 7 at 2. Official Receiver, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool.  
 Orams, Frederick Watts, Leeds, Hay Dealer. Apr 8 at 11. Official Receiver, St Andrew's chbrs, 22, Park Row, Leeds.  
 Payne, George H. and Co, Fenchurch st, Ship Brokers. Apr 19 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 Pridmore, Joseph, Eaton Socon, Bedfordshire, Grocer. Apr 15 at 1. Railway Inn, St Neots, Hunts.  
 Richards, Thomas, Dowlais, nr Merthyr Tydfil, Bootmaker. Apr 7 at 12. Official Receiver, Merthyr Tydfil.  
 Rowe, George, Hanley, Staffordshire, Boot Manufacturer. Apr 8 at 11. Official Receiver, Newcastle under Lyme.  
 Shakespeare, William, Carew, Netherseal, Leicestershire, Farmer. Apr 6 at 2. White Hart Hotel, Burton upon Trent.  
 Slater, Joseph, Newcastle under Lyme, Beerhouse Keeper. Apr 7 at 8.30. Official Receiver, Newcastle under Lyme.  
 Smart, William, Petersfield, Hants, Cabinet Maker. Apr 7 at 12.30. Chamber of Commerce, 145, Cheapside.  
 Steele, Jonathan, Kirklington, Cumberland, Shoemaker. Apr 8 at 12. Official Receiver, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle.  
 Stemming, Alfred, Brighton, Builder. Apr 7 at 12. Official Receiver, 39, Bond st, Brighton.  
 Stones, Edwin, Woodville, Leicestershire, Grocer. Apr 6 at 3. White Hart Hotel, Burton upon Trent.  
 Sulzberger, Hartmann Henry, Anerley Park, Penge, out of business. Apr 8 at 3. Official Receiver, 109, Victoria st, Westminster.  
 Taylor, Walter Arthur, Roxby Vicarage, nr Brigg, Clerk in Holy Orders. Apr 14 at 2. Official Receiver, 3, Haven st, Grimsby.  
 Taylor, John, Knavesmire rd, Forest Gate, no occupation. Apr 8 at 19. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 Taylor, Thomas, Uttoxeter, Staffordshire, Wheelwright. Apr 7 at 3. White Hart Hotel, Uttoxeter.  
 Thomas, William, Shrewsbury, Painter. Apr 12 at 11.30. Law Society, Talbot Chambers, Shrewsbury.  
 Wade, Samuel, Liversedge, Yorks, Currier. Apr 6 at 11. Official Receiver, Batley.  
 Waters, Arthur Bartholomew, Brighton, Grocer. Apr 7 at 2. Bankruptcy bldgs, Portugal st, Lincoln's Inn.  
 Watts, Walter James, Thame st, Rotherhithe, Boat Builder. Apr 9 at 11. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 White, Ebenezer Lilly, Birmingham, Black Ornament Manufacturer. Apr 9 at 11. Official Receiver, Birmingham.  
 Williams, George, Wellesley Court rd, Croydon, Builder. Apr 9 at 1. Official Receiver, 105, Victoria st, Westminster.  
 Williams, William, Redland, Bristol, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Apr 8 at 12.30. Official Receiver, Bank Chambers, Bristol.  
 Wingrave, Francis Thomas, Bridport pl, Hoxton, Draper. Apr 12 at 2. 33, Carey st, Lincoln's Inn Fields.  
 Woodham, Henry, Hungerford, Berks, Watchmaker. Apr 7 at 4. Jack Hotel, Newbury.
- ADJUDICATIONS.**
- Abbott, John, Ambleside, Westmorland, Saddler. Kendal. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 25.  
 Ashworth, John Firth, Hebdon Bridge, Yorks, Newspaper Proprietor. Burnley. Pet Mar 8. Ord Mar 25.  
 Beynon, James Henry, Swansea, General Dealer. Swansea. Pet Mar 26. Ord Mar 27.  
 Bird, William Barber, Biggleswade, Bedfordshire, Grocer. Bedford. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 25.  
 Clarke, Arthur George, Newcastle on Tyne, Pork Butcher. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25.  
 Cockedge, George Bloomfield, Guildford, Surrey, Coal Merchant. Guildford and Godalming. Pet Mar 17. Ord Mar 25.  
 Curd, Charles Albert, Onslow rd, Richmond Hill, Watchmaker. Wandsworth. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 25.  
 Day, Francis, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Gentleman. Birmingham. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 25.  
 Dilamore, James Thomas, Bedford, Commission Agent. Bedford. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25.  
 Drakeford, David James Lowndes, Liverpool, Corn Merchant. Liverpool. Pet Feb 22. Ord Mar 25.  
 Emmett, Alfred, Kenton Lodge, near Exeter, Hotel Proprietor. Exeter. Pet Feb 18. Ord Mar 25.  
 Fletcher, William, Pately Bridge, Yorks, Chemist. Northallerton. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25.  
 Fowler, Frederick, Handsworth, Staffordshire, Wire Worker. Birmingham. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 25.

- Glover, Alfred, Bolton, Lancashire, Stonemason. Bolton. Pet Feb 26. Ord Mar 26.  
 Hardacre, William Smith, Bury, Lancashire, Boot Manufacturer. Bolton. Pet Mar 12. Ord Mar 26.  
 Harris, Reuben, Neath, Glamorganshire, Picture Frame Manufacturer. Neath. Pet Mar 11. Ord Mar 26.  
 Harrison, Thomas, Careby, nr Stamford, Lincolnshire, Farmer. Peterborough. Pet Mar 27. Ord Mar 27.  
 Hesketh, Constance Maria, Tarporley, Cheshire, Spinster. Nantwich and Crewe. Pet Dec 15. Ord Mar 26.  
 Hessell, Robert, West Cottingwith, Yorks, Farmer. York. Pet Mar 20. Ord Mar 26.  
 Hays, William Henry, Dewsbury, Yorks, Innkeeper. Dewsbury. Pet Mar 8. Ord Mar 26.  
 Hobson, Thomas, Wilmslow, Cheshire, Cotton Merchant. Manchester. Pet Mar 10. Ord Mar 27.  
 Hoog, John, High st, Marylebone, Public house Manager. High Court. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 26.  
 Horton, John, Ferndale, Glamorganshire, Fishmonger. Pontypridd. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 25.  
 Johnson, Edward, Winton, Yorks, Saddler. Kingston upon Hull. Pet Mar 21. Ord Mar 25.  
 Leaver, William, Preston, Lancashire, Blacksmith. Preston. Pet Mar 13. Ord Mar 27.  
 Lovett, Charles, Watford, Handle Manufacturer. St Albans. Pet Mar 6. Ord Mar 20.  
 McTear, George, and Thomas Embleton Horrocks, Liverpool, Felt Manufacturers. Liverpool. Pet Mar 6. Ord Mar 26.  
 Mitchell, Peter, Bury, Lancashire, out of business. Bolton. Pet Mar 11. Ord Mar 26.  
 Moore, Daniel, jun., Walsall, Builder and Brickmaker. Walsall. Pet Mar 21. Ord Mar 26.  
 Piper, Edward, Winchester, Fishmonger. Winchester. Pet Mar 22. Ord Mar 25.  
 Pissey, Susan, and Seline Pissey, Little Wakering, Essex, Farmers. Chelmsford. Pet Feb 17. Ord Mar 25.  
 Pridmore, Joseph, Eaton Socon, Bedfordshire, Grocer. Bedford. Pet Mar 21. Ord Mar 25.  
 Rowe, George, Hanley, Boot Manufacturer. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25.  
 Sanderson, Thomas, Bootle, nr Liverpool, Laundryman. Liverpool. Pet Mar 9. Ord Mar 27.  
 Shepherd, Heaton, Bradford, Yorks, Butcher. Huddersfield. Pet Mar 23. Ord Mar 25.  
 Slater, Joseph, Newcastle under Lyme, Beerhouse Keeper. Hanley, Burslem, and Tunstall. Pet Mar 24. Ord Mar 24.  
 Somerton, John, Worcester, out of business. Worcester. Pet Mar 18. Ord Mar 27.  
 Steele, Jonathan, Kirklington, Cumberland, Shoemaker. Carlisle. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 26.  
 Thorne, William Richard, Penarth, Glamorganshire, Builder. Cardiff. Pet Mar 25. Ord Mar 25.  
 Tuff, Edward, and Walter Nottingham, Houndsditch, Hardware Factors. High Court. Pet Feb 22. Ord Mar 26.  
 Walker, John Henry, Hatfield Peverel, Essex, Brick Merchant. Chelmsford. Pet Jan 14. Ord Mar 15.  
 Whiting, Elizabeth, Kensington gdns sq, Lodging House Keeper. High Court. Pet Mar 27. Ord Mar 27.  
 Williams, George, Wellesley rd, Croydon, Builder. Croydon. Pet Feb 11. Ord Mar 26.  
 Yates, George, Bow Brickhill, Buckinghamshire, Farmer. Northampton. Pet Mar 19. Ord Mar 22.

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 2s.; Country, 28.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volume, bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

## CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS .....	365	Mann v. The Patent Cable Tramways Corporation .....	370
SERVICE OF WRITS OUT OF THE JURISDICTION .....	366	Constable v. Constable .....	371
THE NEW COUNTY COURT RULES .....	367	Re Anglo-African Steamship Co. (Limited) .....	371
CORRESPONDENCE .....	368	Pollerton v. Gibson .....	371
CASES OF THE WEEK:—		Manchester Guardians v. Ormskirk Union .....	371
COURT OF APPEAL:—		In the Goods of Gosling .....	371
Bryant v. Reading (E. C. Readling, Claimant) .....	368	CASES AFFECTING SOLICITORS:—	
Midland Railway Co., Appellants; Walton, Respondent .....	368	Re Dean, Ward v. Holmes .....	371
Stanley v. Stockport .....	369	Re Russell, Son, & Scott .....	371
Re Hudson, Trade-Marks .....	369	SOCIETIES .....	372
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE:—		LEGAL APPOINTMENTS .....	372
Re Batcheller, Batcheller v. Batcheller .....	369	THE PROPOSED REPEAL OF THE INVESTIGATIVE DUTY .....	373
Gibson v. Way .....	369	LEGAL NEWS .....	374
Re Wilson, Wilson v. Cross .....	370	COUPLET PAPERS .....	374
Saul v. Pattinson .....	370	COMPANIES .....	375
Archer v. Archer .....	370	CREDITORS' CLAIMS .....	375
LONDON GAZETTE, &c. &c. .....	372	LONDON GAZETTE, &c. &c. .....	375

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All communications intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.

\* \* \* The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, as only a small number of copies remain on hand.

**SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA.**

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.  
Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa or the Finest Quality  
with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounced it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoa thickened you weakened with starch, &c., and in reality cheaper than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VARENNE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manila Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 2d., 2s. 6d., 5s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietor.

H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 16, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.C.

**ENGINEERING EXPERT, EVIDENCE, ARBITRATIONS, &c.—M. POWIS RALE, M. Inst. M.E., A.M. Inst. C.E., Author of several successful Engineering Works, and with twenty years' practical experience, undertakes the above in addition to his ordinary business.—Appold-street, London, E.C.**

**THE CIVIL SERVICE CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY,** Limited, 28, Haymarket, London, S.W. (Established 1886.)

**SHARES.**

By Resolution passed at a Special General Meeting, held the 9th June, 1886, the power of holding Shares in this Company, which had hitherto been limited to the Civil Service, was extended to Officers in the Army, Navy, Yeomanry, and Militia, and to members of the Clerical, Legal, and Medical Professions. Full particulars can be obtained on application to the Secretary.

**PRICE LIST.**

A revised Price List of Groceries and Provisions, showing considerable reductions in prices, was published on the 1st March, and will be forwarded on application to the Secretary, by whom all particulars as to membership will be furnished.

**CAVENDISH COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.**

An EXAMINATION will be held at the COLLEGE on AUGUST 4, 5 and 6, 1886, for the Award of TWO SCHOLARSHIPS, of the value of £30 each, tenable for three years, offered by the CLOTH-WORKERS' COMPANY and by G. E. FOSTER, Esq.

Candidates must be under the age of 17 on August 6, 1886.

The College charges, £24 per annum, cover all expenses for board (including an extra Term in the Long Vacation and washing) and tuition, including University fees.

For further information apply to the WARDEN, Cavendish College, Cambridge.

**NEW ORIENTAL BANK CORPORATION.** (London.) Capital—Authorised, £2,000,000; Paid-up, £500,000.

London : 49, Threadneedle-street.

BRANCHES and AGENCIES—Edinburgh, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Ceylon, Mauritius, Singapore, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Yokohama, Kobe, Nagasaki, Melbourne, and Sydney.

The Bank buys and sells Bills of Exchange, makes telegraphic transfers, issues letters of credit and circular notes, forwards bills for collection, and transacts banking and agency business generally.

The Directors are receiving applications for 4 per cent. Debentures in sums of £10 and upwards, secured upon the Freehold bank premises in the City of London and elsewhere.

Creditors of the old Bank can obtain 3 per cent debentures for the balance of their claims.

**GUARDIAN FIRE and LIFE OFFICE.**

Head Office—11, Lombard-street, London, E.C.

Law Courts Branch—21, Fleet-street, E.C.

Established 1821. Subscribed Capital, Two Millions.

**DIRECTORS:**

CHAIRMAN—ALAN G. H. GIBBS, Esq.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—BRAUNTON W. LUBBOCK, Esq.

Rowland Nevitt Bennett, Esq.

Henry Bonham-Carter, Esq.

Charles F. Dovas, Esq.

James Goodson, Esq.

John J. Hamilton, Esq.

Thomson Hankey, Esq.

Richard M. Harvey, Esq.

Rt. Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P.

John Hunter, Esq.

MANAGER OF FIRE DEPARTMENT—F. J. Marsden.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY—T. G. C. Browne.

Share Capital at present paid up and invested..... £1,000,000

Total Funds upwards of ..... £3,000,000

Total Annual Income over ..... £75,000

N.B.—Fire Policies which expire at LADY DAY should be renewed at the Head Office, or with the Agents, on or before the 9th day of APRIL.

**EDE AND SON,****ROBE MAKERS,**

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS

**SOLICITORS' GOWNS.**

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace.

CORPORATION ROBES. UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1859.

**94. CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.**

LONDON INSTITUTION,  
FINSBURY CIRCUS, E.C.

**THREE TRAVERS LECTURES**

WILL BE DELIVERED BY

MONTAGUE SHEARMAN, Esq., M.A.

(Barrister-at-Law), ON

**PATENTS AND TRADE-MARKS.**

AND (Vice Dr. Edwin Freshfield), ON

**MARINE INSURANCE.**

On Mondays, April 5th, 12th, & 19th, 1886, at 5 p.m.

PATENTS—April 5th; TRADE-MARKS—April 12th;

MARINE INSURANCE—April 19th.

For particulars apply to J. M. HOESBURGH, Secretary.

**THE NEW ZEALAND LAND MORTGAGE COMPANY, Limited.**

Capital £2,000,000, fully subscribed by more than 800 shareholders.

£200,000 paid up. Reserve Fund, £5,000.

The Company's loans are limited to first-class freehold mortgages. The Debenture issue is limited to the uncalled capital.

**HOME DIRECTORS.**

H. J. BRISTOW, Esq. Sir WILLIAM T. POWER, K.C.B.

W. K. GRAHAM, Esq. FALCONER LAKWORTHY, Esq. T. RUSSELL, Esq. C.M.G.

ARTHUR M. MITCHISON, Sir EDWARD W. STAPFORD, K.C.M.G.

Chairman of Colonial Board.

The Hon. Sir ERNEST WHITAKER, C.M.G., M.L.C.

late Premier of New Zealand.

The Directors are issuing Ten-yearly Debentures bearing interest at 4 per cent. for three years, and 4½ per cent. for five years and upwards. Interest half-yearly by Consols.

A. M. MITCHISON, Managing Director.

Leadenhall-buildings, Leadenhall-st., London, E.C.

**NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY**

Established 1836.

LONDON: 1, Moorgate-street, E.C. ABERDEEN: 1, Union-terrace.

INCOME & FUNDS (1886)—

Fire Premiums .....

Life Premiums .....

Interest .....

Accumulated Funds .....

£257,000

184,000

128,000

£1,993,000

TUESDAYS, JUNE 6, 13, 20, 27, JULY 4, 11, 18, 25, AUGUST 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 1886.

EUROPE, ASIA, FIRE, LIFE & MARINE.

Capital fully subscribed £2,500,000

Total Invested Funds, upwards of £3,000,000

Total net annual Income exceeds £1,200,000

CHIEF OFFICES: 19 AND 20, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.

**ACCIDENTS OF DAILY LIFE**

INSURED AGAINST BY

**THE RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY**

(ESTABLISHED 1849).

**64, CORNHILL, LONDON.**

Capital .....

Income .....

£1,000,000.

£216,000.

COMPENSATION PAID FOR 112,000 ACCIDENTS,

£2,315,000.

CHAIRMAN—MARVIE M. FARQUHAR, Esq.

Apply to the Clerks at the Railway Stations, the Local Agents, or

West-end Office—8, GRAND HOTEL BUILDINGS, W.C.

Or at the

Head Office—64, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

**UNTEARABLE LETTER COPYING BOOKS.**

HOWARD'S PATENT.

Stronger and more durable than any other

Letter Copying Books now made.

THE COPYING BOOK FOR THE PROFESSION

PRICE LIST UPON APPLICATION.

**WODDERSPON & CO.,**  
7, SERLE STREET, AND 1, PORTUGAL STREET  
LINCOLN'S INN, W.C.

**HOME for the TREATMENT and CURE of INEBRIATES.** High Shot House, Twickenham.—The sole establishment in Middlesex licensed under the Act. Charmingly secluded. Gentlemen only. Limited number taken. Billiard room, library, lawn tennis court, bowls, &c. The whole staff pledged abstainers. Terms: 2½ to 5 guineas weekly.—Particulars from the Medical Superintendent, H. BRANTWAITE, F.R.C.S. Ed.; and reference is permitted to Messrs. MUNTON & MORRIS, Solicitors, 95a, Queen Victoria-street, London.

**INTEMPERANCE.**—Tower House Retreat, Westgate-on-Sea, Kent, licensed under the Habitual Drunkards' Act, 1879.—The only establishment in the United Kingdom specially erected for Reception and Treatment of Ladies and Gentlemen desirous of overcoming habits of Intemperance. The house stands in its own grounds of nearly three acres, and is replete with every convenience, containing a large billiard room, spacious drawing rooms, smoking rooms, bath rooms, &c. Patients can be received under the H. D. Act or privately. Terms: from Two to Five Guineas per week.—For prospectus and further particulars address J. H. BROWN, Principal. Telegraphic address, Brown, Westgate-on-Sea. Visiting Physician, ALFRED S. STREET, M.D., B.S. Cantab.

**LONDON.—SHIRLEY'S TEMPERANCE HOTEL,** 37, Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, W.C.—Beds, 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d.; plain breakfast or tea, 1s. 3d. This old-established Hotel is most centrally situated about midway between the City and West-end, near to the chief railway-stations and places of amusement, within five minutes' walk of great thoroughfares and lines of omnibuses, and being in a square, is very quiet and open. The house is most home-like, and highly-satisfactory testimonials may be had on application.

SALES FOR THE YEAR 1886.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER** beg to announce that their SALES of LANDED ESTATES, Investments, Town, Suburban, and Country Houses, Business Premises, Building Land, Ground-rents, Advowsons, Reversions, Stocks, Shares, and other Properties, will be held at the Auction Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, near the Bank of England, in the City of London, as follows:—

Tues., April 6	Tues., June 6	Tues., Aug 10
Tues., April 13	Tues., June 22	Tues., Aug 17
Tues., April 20	Tues., June 29	Tues., Aug 24
Tues., May 4	Tues., July 6	Tues., Aug 31
Tues., May 11	Tues., July 13	Tues., Oct 5
Tues., May 18	Tues., July 20	Tues., Oct 19
Tues., May 25	Tues., July 27	Tues., Nov 9
Tues., June 1	Tues., Aug 3	Tues., Nov 23
		Tues., Dec 14

Actions can also be held on other days. In any case notice should be given, in order to insure proper publicity; the period between such notice and the auction must, of course, considerably depend upon the nature of the property intended to be sold.—80, Cheapside, London.

**MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER**'s LIST of LANDED ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

**TO SOLICITORS and Others.**—Lefty and Well-lighted Offices and Chambers to be Let at London Chambers, No. 27, Chancery-lane (opposite the New Law Courts). Also large, well-furnished Rooms for Meetings, Arbitrations, &c. Apply to Messrs. LAUNDRY & CO., Chartered Accountants, on the premises.

# LAW UNION FIRE & LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED IN THE YEAR 1854.

The only Law Insurance Office in the United Kingdom which transacts both Fire and Life Insurance Business.

CHIEF OFFICE—126, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

**The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,800,000 Sterling.**

*By express provision in the Company's Deed of Settlement, and by the Conditions of the Policies of the Company, the Capital and Funds of each Department are and always have been kept distinct, and under no circumstances can the Capital or Funds of one Department be applied to the payment of Losses or Expenses incurred in the other Department.*

CHAIRMAN: JAMES CUDDON, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-law.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pembertons), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

Extract from the Report of the Directors for the year ended 30th November, 1885:—

In the Fire Department the number of new Insurances effected during the year was 8,214, for an aggregate sum insured of £7,093,065, yielding in new Premiums the sum of £11,080 8s. 9d.

In the Life Department during the same period 243 Policies were effected, insuring £277,780, the new Premiums upon which amounted to £8,585 11s. 5d., of which £2,685 1s. 1d. was paid away for reinsurance. Twenty Proposals for insuring £19,350 were declined, and 67 Proposals for insuring £52,187 were uncompleted in the year.

Fourteen Life Annuities for £537 5s. 6d. per annum were granted, the purchase-money for which amounted to £5,790 12s. 8d., and one Survivorship Annuity was also granted, at an Annual Premium of £48 9s. 2d. Eleven Annuities for £477 4s. 2d. per annum became void by death during the year.

The Claims under Life Policies were below the expectation, and were less than those of the year 1884 by the sum of £3,333 8s. 9d.

The Fire Losses were much below those of the last preceding year, being about 33 per cent. of the net Premiums received in the year.

The average rate of Interest realized on the whole of the Assets of the Company was £4 10s. 9d. per cent. (free of Income Tax).

Liberal Settlement of Losses. Moderate Rates of Premium. Profits divided every five years in the Life Department. Life Policies, free from all Conditions and Restrictions, are granted at a slightly increased Premium. Policies of Insurance granted against the contingency of Issue at moderate rates of Premium. Claims under Life Policies payable immediately on proof of death and title. Loans are granted on Mortgage of Life Interests, Reversions, Leasehold Houses, &c. Reversions purchased. Prospectuses and every information may be obtained from

FRANK McGEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

## THE CALIGRAPH, THE FASTEST, LIGHTEST, AND MOST DURABLE WRITING MACHINE, IS RAPIDLY DISPLACING THE PEN.

Because, by its use, more than 50 per cent. in time and labour is saved, and it turns off work that is as easily and rapidly read as printing. To Solicitors and for Court work the "Caligraph" is invaluable, for, in addition to advantages named above, a number of exact duplicates of any instrument may be made at one writing. "Copy" for the printer ought to be written on the "Caligraph," for it will always be set up correctly, and much more rapidly.

It is easily operated, and does not get out of order. Special Wide Carriage Machine, which takes in a sheet of paper 11in. wide, and writes a line 9in. long.

Sole Agent for the United Kingdom—

T. DAVISON,  
18, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, LONDON, E.C.

## PARTRIDGE & COOPER. LAW AND GENERAL STATIONERS, 1 & 2, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, E.C.

### Law Copying and Engrossing.

Deeds and Writings engrossed and copied on the Premises with punctuality and dispatch, at the lowest scale of charges. A good Discount allowed on agreed accounts

#### LAW PRINTING.

STATEMENTS OF CLAIM AND DEFENCE, AF DAVIDS, and other PLEADING, Printed at 1s. per folio DEEDS, CONVEYANCES, MORTGAGES, &c., Print in form for Registration.

Discount allowed for cash on agreed accounts.

#### LITHOGRAPHY.

ABSTRACTS, BRIEFS, PETITIONS, DRAFTS MINUTES OF EVIDENCE, Lithographed at reduced prices.

PLANS OF ESTATES, SPECIFICATIONS, BUILDING SOCIETIES' DEEDS, LEASES, &c., Lithographed with accuracy and dispatch.

#### PARCHMENT AND LEGAL PAPERS

Samples and Catalogues sent post-free.

The PHYSIOLOGICAL ART OF NEVER FORGETTING—*—walks Mnemonics.* “His method is physiological and scientific in the highest degree.”—DR. WILSON. “Prof. Loiselet gave me a new system of mnemonics, called ‘The Memory System’—Dr. H. F. BROWN, Q.C. It is a perfect memory system.”—“The Weekly Budget.” “By its instrumentality I mastered an extensive Work of Science in one month, and now I can repeat it in a few minutes. It is sometimes by my natural memory I could not have known it so well.”—C. SAWYER, Esq. “Every day I am a proof to myself that your Method is really an improvement on ‘Learn and Never Forget.’”—L'ABBE MALATRAY. “As to the ‘Never Forgetting,’ I quite agree with the justice of the claim.”—MAJOR-General G. R. G. MEADE. “I have nothing but what you really carry out.”—REV. WM. NICHOLSON. “Greatly improved my Correspondence and Office Classes and Private Pupil.” Prospectus sent free from

PROF. LOISELET, 5, New Oxford Street, London.

BY AUTHORITY.

The Companies Acts, 1882 to 1883.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The BOOKS and FORMS kept in stock for immediate use.

MEMORANDA and ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION specially printed in the proper form for registration and distribution. SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c., engraved and printed. OFFICIAL SEALS designed and executed. No Charge for Sketches.

#### Solicitors' Account Books.

## RICHARD FLINT & CO.

(late ASH & FLINT).

Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, 49, FLEET-STREET, LONDON, E.C. (corner of Servants'-Inn).

Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

FURNISH your HOUSES or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT ON MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal.

Founded A.D. 1868.

Cash prices. No extra charge for time given. Particulars, estimates, Price opinions, testimonials, post-free.

F. MOEDER, 242, 249, and 250, Tottenham-court-road, and 19, 20, and 21, Morwell-street, W. Established 1868.

ALSO for HIRE ONLY.

MESSRS. JOHNSON & DYMOND beg to announce that their Sales by Auction of Plate, Watches, Chains, Jewellery, Precious Stones, &c., are held on Mondays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays.

The attention of Solicitors, Executors, Trustees, and others is particularly called to this ready means for the disposal of Property of deceased and other clients.

In consequence of the frequency of their sales Messrs. J. & D. are enabled to include large or small quantities at short notice (if required).

Sales of Furniture held at private houses.

Valuations for Probate or Transfer. Terms on application to the City Auction Rooms (established 1793), 36 and 39, Gracechurch-street, E.C.

Messrs. Johnson & Dymond beg to notify that their Auction Sales of Wearing Apparel, Piece Goods, Household and Office Furniture, Carpets, Bedding, &c., are held on each day of the week Saturday excepted.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

BIRKBECK BANK.—Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane. THREE per CENT. INTEREST allowed on DEPOSITS, repayable on demand.

TWO per CENT. INTEREST on CURRENT ACCOUNTS calculated on the minimum monthly balances, when not drawn below £100.

The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of Charge, the Custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuables; the collection of Bills or Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks, Shares, and Annuities. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

The BIRKBECK ALMANACK, with full particulars, post-free, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager.

EPPS'S  
GRATEFUL-COMFORTING  
COCOA.